DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 365 894 CG 025 156

AUTHOR Lenz, Janet, Ed.
TITLE Institute on College Student Values Proceedings (Tallahassee, Florida, February 1993).
INSTITUTION Florida State Univ., Tallahassee. Div. of Student Affairs.
PUB DATE 93
NOTE 42p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Students; Ethics; Higher Education; *Moral Development; *Student Attitudes; Student Development; Student Personnel Services; *Values

ABSTRACT

This document presents articles from the 1993 Institute on College Student Values, an annual seminar sponsored by the Florida State University Division of Student Affairs to provide a forum for discussion of research, educational strategies, and current developments related to the ethical development of students during the college years. The 1993 Institute examined ethical development issues in students' learning and growth during the college years with a special focus on creating community on campus. Included are articles from four major speakers: (1) "The Undergraduate Experience: In Search of Values" (Ernest Boyer); (2) "Learning From Simon's Rock" (Helen Horowitz); (3) "Promoting Social Responsibility: A Challenge for Higher Education" (Alexander Astin); and (4) "Who Is There Big Enough To Love the Whole Planet?" (William Sloane Coffin). Also included are abstracts from concurrent sessions on creating community on the college campus; student service and the struggle for a public voice; social corrections, mutual respect and valued concepts of right and wrong; the value of the academy; unnatural acts in the world; creating a democratic community in an undergraduate residence hall; academic integrity among college students; empowerment of students against racism; developing values through communication; social responsibility; caring as an emerging value in the classroom-as-community; integrating values education into an elective program; religious tradition and ethical development; and multicultural community building. The Institute program agenda is included. (NB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 365 894

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jon Dalton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Florida State University
Division of Student Affairs

Institute on College Student Values 1993

Proceedings

Wakulla Springs Lodge
and Conference Center

Tallahassee, Florida

CG025156

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Florida State University
Division of Student Affairs

Institute on College Student Values 1993

Proceedings

Wakulla Springs Lodge
and Conference Center

Tallahassee, Florida
February, 1993

Jon Dalton
Vice President
Student Affairs

Sherrill Ragans
Assoc. Vice President
Student Affairs

Janet Lenz
Editor

Michele Weiss
Transcriber

Joyce Howard
Layout

© Copyright 1993
Division of Student Affairs
Florida State University

All rights reserved. Reproduction of any portions of the material herein is prohibited without prior permission of the publisher.

Table of Contents

Introduction iv
Jon Dalton

Major Speakers

The Undergraduate Experience: In Search of Values 1
Ernest Boyer
President, The Carnegie Foundation
for the Advancement of Teaching

Learning From Simon's Rock 7
Helen Horowitz
Professor of History and American Studies
Smith College

Promoting Social Responsibility:
A Challenge for Higher Education 15
Alexander Astin
Director, Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA

Who Is There Big Enough To Love the Whole Planet? 23

William Sloane Coffin
President Emeritus, SANE/FREEZE:
Campaign for Global Security

Concurrent Session Abstracts

Systematic Approaches for Creating Community on the
College Campus: Networks and Collaborations 31

Student Service and the Struggle for A Public Voice 31

Social Correction, Mutual Respect and
Valued Concepts of Right and Wrong 31

The Value of the Academy: An Examination of the
Values of Faculty in Higher Education in the United States 32

Unnatural Acts in the World, the Parish, and the College 32

Social Responsibility Begins at Home? Creating a Democratic Community in an Undergraduate Residence Hall 32

Academic Integrity Among College Students: Student and Faculty Perspective 32

Empowerment of Students Against Racism: The "Layering Model" at Seton Hall University 32

Confrontation: Developing Values Through Communication 32

Social Responsibility: Can Our Words Lead to Actions? 32

Caring as an Emerging Value in the Classroom-as-Community 33

Integrating Values Education Into an Elective Program: Environmental Studies Pathway 33

Reclaiming the Sacred: Connecting the Student's Experience of a Living Religious Tradition to Ethical Development During the Undergraduate Years 33

Multicultural Community Building 33

Institute Program 34

Introduction

The Institute on College Student Values is an annual seminar sponsored by the Florida State University Division of Student Affairs. The Institute provides a forum for discussion of research, educational strategies, and current developments related to the ethical development of students during the college years.

Concern about the moral development of students is not a new theme for higher education in the United States. Character development was one of the principle objectives of America's earliest colleges and universities and has remained an enduring goal of most institutions of higher education. The ethical development of college students is thus an old topic with new relevance for student affairs staff, faculty, administrators, campus ministers, and others interested in promoting the moral development of college students.

The 1993 Institute on College Student Values, from which the articles in this volume of proceedings have been drawn, examined ethical development issues in students' learning and growth during the college years. The special focus of this year's Institute was on creating community on campus.

We appreciate the leadership and inspiration which each of our authors provided at the 1993 Institute. We are grateful to them for permission to publish their presentations and believe that readers will find these summaries to be provocative and helpful in thinking about the responsibilities of college and universities for promoting values development in college students.

Jon C. Dalton
Vice President for Student Affairs
Florida State University

The Undergraduate Experience: In Search of Values

Ernest L. Boyer
President
The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

From birth to death, all of us engage in a quest to understand what life means. We are trying to give value and direction to our lives. This search for meaning is a journey we all share. Of course, we develop our personal values through our own private reflections and through our closest relationships with family and friends, but we also establish our values in extremely significant ways within the context of the larger community. When we search for and try to develop values within the undergraduate experience, then, we are defining a community—a community of learning that has integrity and purpose, one in which students can confidently, conscientiously, and thoughtfully develop their sense of values. In the diverse and often confusing world of the college campus, how do we create such a community and what values should we seek to instill in the young people engaged there in higher learning?

At The Carnegie Foundation we studied community in higher education and published in 1990 a report, *Campus Life: In Search of Community*. Starting that monograph, we tried to take each of the campus "social pathologies" and make recommendations to overcome each. But many of these ideas had already been tried and found inadequate. Out of desperation, I discarded the tired, bulleted recommendations about how to fix the campus community crisis and began to reflect on the central questions: "What are the principles on which a higher learning community is founded?" "What is the infrastructure of meaning and purpose in a campus community?" We settled on six principles to shape the value system of the academic culture, which, if properly pursued, can strengthen community on campus and create a climate in which sensible and humane values can flourish.

I.

First, a campus community grows stronger when its members share purposes and goals. When they do, students develop wide-ranging allegiances and loyalties. We all need, in spite of our sense of independence, to feel that we belong, that we have developed relationships that give purpose, connections that inspire and motivate.

To illustrate, during my first week as Commissioner of Education, I encountered the head of the Civil Service Union in the corridor. She asked if I would meet with her the next week, and I said, "Well, of course." As soon as she walked away, my associates, who'd been there longer than I, said: "No, you don't do it that way. She's the head of the Civil Service Union. You only meet with her in a formal setting, across the table." I said, "I'm sorry. I'm the new kid on the block. She's a human being. She happens to work at the U.S. Office of Education. She wants to talk with me; I'd like to talk to her." They were dazzled and depressed. But I was caught off guard, and that weekend I took heavy books home and read about regulations, salary agreements, and fringe benefits. Having done my homework, I came in Monday for the meeting. We went to my office, exchanged pleasantries, and I invited her to begin our discussion. She looked at me and said, "Mr. Commissioner, can you tell us why we're here?" I said: "What do you mean?" She said: "What is the purpose of the U.S. Office of Education?" I was perplexed. Purpose? This is *Washington*, this is *government*. Purpose? But I understood both the power and the pathos of that question. This woman represented individuals with high salaries, terrific fringe benefits, eternal security, and yet she was saying, "Is there, in this government bureaucracy, a larger mission?"

We often, unwittingly, create climates in which people lose their energy and inspiration, at least from nine to five. We create bureaucracies in which there are no shared purposes and goals. Zest vanishes when there is no shared vision to get people out of bed each day.

Within the academy, too, we have created a climate that fragments purposes and goals more than it integrates them. On most campuses, we see two separate

cultures reflecting two separate traditions. The tension between the two spheres is ongoing.

The "student culture" draws its inspiration from the colonial college tradition. When Harvard College was founded in 1636, the focus was on the student, on general education, and on loyalty to the campus. This tradition persisted in one form or another into the nineteenth century, when higher education slowly began to shift to the German university tradition, in which the focus was not on the student but on the professoriate; not on general education but on specialized education; not on loyalty to the campus, but on loyalty to the "guild."

During our 1987 study, *College: The Undergraduate Experience*, a researcher interviewed a faculty member who said, "My community is reached over the watts line, not by walking down the hall." Today, professors live on campus, but their intellectual culture and community extend nationally and globally. So instead of a sense of coherence, with professors and students working together, we have a divided world in which faculty and students do not speak comfortably with each other.

When colleges recruit students, they are collegiate to the core. They want to convince students and their parents that the university is a place of intellect, social virtue, and compassion. When recruiting students, the institution promotes the colonial tradition that it is, indeed, a culture for students. For the *College* report, we studied promotional material used by colleges and universities, and we found in all of them words like "caring" and "community." One institution called itself a "family," though it enrolled forty thousand students. We examined pictures in the viewbooks, showing faculty and students strolling woodsy paths or chatting over coffee, leading us to conclude that 60 percent of all college classes are held underneath trees by gently flowing streams.

Apparently, in American higher education we still retain this urge to be *collegial*. People like a community that focuses on the student, general education, and loyalty to the campus. But often when students get to campus, they discover that these images are illusions. Conditions tend not to favor freshmen and sophomores. As they progress through the system, they increasingly merge with the faculty culture. Choosing a major brings them closer. By the time they get to graduate school, they are much more accepted by faculty. When they get the Ph.D., they've arrived. But the community suggested by most viewbooks does not represent authentically the undergraduate years.

I find a fundamental ambivalence within American higher education. Almost all of the tensions we have in higher education today begin with the differences between the colonial college tradition, with its roots in the British university system, and the German university tradition.

This struggle raises issues about campus life, residential living, and student values. Many administrators and faculty are uncomfortable even talking about *students*, to say nothing about student *values*. To uphold the colonial college tradition, higher education has created a separate support system called "student services." It has even organized an administrative structure to handle "that other college" until all those unwashed freshmen and sophomores start to find a real place in the academy and join the academic culture. It will be very difficult, if not impossible, for the academy to encourage student values worthy of a higher learning community if the campus remains divided between the student and faculty cultures rather than finding larger, transcendent purposes to unite the two.

In the absence of cohesion, the academy experiences what the nation experiences. Larger loyalties yield to little loyalties. People hunker down within their social enclaves and substitute smaller, private goals for larger, integrated efforts. It isn't easy for higher education, with all of its diversity, to develop shared purposes and goals that can inspire a whole community, including freshmen, but to bring students to campus and make them feel excluded from the community of learning is not only risky but unethical as well. We must, through leadership and freshman orientation, define missions that include and engage freshmen and sophomores, that make them feel bound to a higher learning community.

We should refer to John Gardner's work on the "national freshman year experience." The freshman year can be a time when students not only complete their academic credits but also become enculturated in a community of learning. This culture should convey purposes and goals that touch the life of every student. Faculty should meet with students not just to help them complete their credits but to help them grow as human beings.

Building a true community of learning on campus also involves, of course, the size of the institution. In the 1950s, I was dean of a liberal arts college with 150 students. In the 1970s I was Chancellor of a university with 350,000 students on 64 campuses. Experience has taught me that smallness alone does not make community. I've seen small colleges that, frankly, were torn apart. People didn't speak; they did not share purposes and goals. Experience has also taught me that in large institutions,

there must be communities within communities; otherwise, connectedness around common purposes can be difficult to sustain with any consistency.

If we want to support young adults as they continue forming the values they will carry with them throughout their lives, we must pay attention to the campus communities that we build. The first and most essential requisite for building community on campus is to develop, at the core, shared purposes and goals around the *educational* mission of the institution. Faculty and students should have a sense of working together to strengthen teaching and learning on their campus. Students should feel included and challenged in a vigorous intellectual enterprise, and faculty should be rewarded for their engagement with students. All should participate in intellectual discourse informed by a well-planned general education sequence, a core curriculum with coherence.

II.

This leads to the second requisite—freedom of expression combined with civility. The spirit of campus community is strengthened when the members speak and listen to each other. Good *community* means good *communication*. In academic life, in spite of the apparent collegiality and civility, the quality of discourse is often trivial. People are not in serious communication.

In most higher education institutions, large or small, we find the "industrial model" of organization, based upon flow chart—a model, I believe, inappropriate to the mission of higher learning. A flow chart generally starts at the pinnacle and develops *down* to form a pyramid. People living within this structure communicate according to its demands, and generally it demands that everyone stay at his or her own level, wearing his or her assigned mask.

I remember a song from the 1960s by the Beatles called "Eleanor Rigby," who put on a mask that she kept in a jar by the door. In the academy, as elsewhere, people put on the masks they keep in a jar by the door. I recall the sixties with great ambivalence, but I have very positive feelings about the "teach-ins" during that turbulent period. Administrators became so desperate they finally said, "I don't have anything else to suggest, why don't we get together and talk about it?" These teachins were often raucous, complete with shouting and obscenities. But there were moments when the place quieted, and we didn't ask whether we were students or administrators or assistant professors. Rather, we expressed our concerns as people—about the war, about civil rights, about human justice—and we listened. I thought, this is what a university, at least occasionally, is all about: pursuing the intellectual life, and asking the essential questions with respectful diligence, regardless of the categories and the boxes. That happens all too rarely.

What we do not have in American higher education, or in most of our institutions generally, is what I call the "horizontal model" of communicating. American higher education does not have credible forums, with integrity and continuity, that allow us to communicate across departmental lines about larger purposes. Rather, when we really have a problem, we create *ad hoc* committees. They meet for thirty days or sixty days or six months. They issue their report. It's read fleetingly and then everyone goes back into their boxes. The communication and effort are not sustained. A higher learning community needs structures that promote communication across lines that divide.

Beyond freedom of expression and civility in discourse, the academy has the obligation to establish truthfulness as the goal of communication. How can we convey to students that in the end what really matters is *truthfulness*, not just technical correctness? Elton Trueblood, who for years was the president of a Quaker college, Earlham College, in Richmond, Indiana, wrote about truth in higher learning in a reminiscence of his own student days. When he was a graduate student at Johns Hopkins, he had a professor who, following the traditional Oxford model, required students to write a paper every week. Dr. Trueblood said that after this professor had checked all the footnotes and critiqued the logic and the process, he would write at the bottom: "Is it true? Is it really *true*?" Students must be held accountable in their communication not just for the accuracy of the footnotes, but for the *integrity* of the message as well. The undergraduate experience should, above all, teach students that honesty is the obligation we assume when we communicate with others.

III.

The third requirement for building a campus community is a commitment to diversity and human justice. This nation is dangerously divided along racial and ethnic lines, and the college campus reflects these separations. When we were conducting our study *Campus Life*, we found racial- and gender-driven hostilities expressed in degrading and obscene comments, even printed on fraternity t-shirts. What's happened to create a culture in which *university students* talk about other human beings in degrading and disgraceful ways? What's happened to the value system in higher education that sustains such obliviousness to the dignity and sacredness

of other individuals? Colleges encounter these attitudes and this behavior more and more frequently. Surely, the undergraduate experience should take place in a climate that affirms the essentialness of diversity and the dignity of individual differences.

I've been asked repeatedly what to do about this growing tension. I do not think that we can control hate language with prior restraint. Regulating what students can say and write proves to be ineffectual as well as unconstitutional. What the university has and must exert is moral authority. I do think that the hateful language of bigotry has to be judged unacceptable by the highest authorities on the campus, and I would hope that we can learn how to create campus communities in which diversity is authentically affirmed.

About a year ago, I was walking with the president of a large, state university across the campus at noontime, with hundreds of students all around us. He said, "Look around. It looks as if it all blends, but I am running three separate campuses here—three separate institutions. There's the African-American institution, the white, and the Asian-American. They do not seriously interact with one another." So it's not a matter of simply achieving diversity through the admissions process. It's a matter of creating connections and fostering respect. And this doesn't happen in large groups. I have been in large meetings where hundreds of students have gathered on the issue of being more tolerant. "Tolerance" can be an unhappy term. It can mean, "I'll put up with you." Often when the issues of tolerance and diversity are discussed in such forums, the speeches seem to *hurt* more than to *heal*.

The Quakers have an interesting term, "weighty brethren," meaning the people who, regardless of the offices they hold, are well regarded by their peers, who are listened to by others. Their words have *weight* in the community. Perhaps the "weighty brothers" and "weighty sisters" within the separate groups on campus could be brought together for several weeks, to work together, to reveal themselves, to express anger perhaps, but also to seek understanding and develop respect for each other. Here I must make the critical point that while fostering respect for diversity, we must also discover human *commonalities*—those experiences shared by all people—because we are all interdependent. We must not allow the language of diversity to obscure the profound connections among people that transcend all differences.

IV.

The spirit of campus community is strengthened when its members accept, as a fourth requirement, a disciplined life, both academically and socially. The culture in the United States today celebrates *freedom* more often than it encourages *responsibility*. Children grow up with a sense of individualism, but lack opportunities to develop responsibility and find out how they can contribute to the larger society.

The Carnegie Foundation surveyed five thousand fifth- and eighth-graders and found that 30 percent of them said they go home every afternoon to an empty house. Sixty percent of them said they wished they could spend more time with their mothers and fathers, and about twothirds said they wished they had more things to do. The simple truth is that this country is neglecting its children. Many children are growing up essentially alone, developing their value systems with few anchor points in meaningful relationships with their elders.

During our study of the American high school in 1983, I concluded that we have not only a *school* problem but also a *youth* problem in this country. Many young people are socially disengaged. They are not being taught the civic virtues in which individual freedoms yield to social constraints to serve a greater good. They are not given the opportunities and encouragement to make community contributions that will help them learn these values.

What then can colleges and universities do to instill more of a sense of community and social obligation in students today? During most of the history of higher education in this country, colleges assumed the role of parents, exercising authority over moral development as well as intellectual development. During the turbulent 1960s, these ground rules changed. *In loco parentis* was formally abolished, but we had no other theory of campus governance to replace it. Further, we encountered the problem that parents—and "the media"—didn't agree that the college was no longer the acting parent. Colleges and universities were left in an ambiguous position, unable to exercise authority over students' social life, but held responsible if anything went wrong. The universities are held accountable in the court of public opinion and the court of law. Universities are still expected to help students understand the relationship between individual freedom and social responsibility—a difficult task.

I believe that higher education is overregulated academically and underregulated civically and socially. We abolished *in loco parentis* covering social life, but we over-parent when it comes to academic life, where degree programs are basically nonnegotiable. So students live in a rigid, parental, nonnegotiable world academically, but outside the classroom, they live without any anchor points or expectations.

Aren't we sending students two contradictory messages? Should we instead acknowledge more often that they do have some freedom to think through their educational purposes, engage in self-directed study, define with more independence their own intellectual lives? And in social and civic life, should we assert more authority to help students learn boundaries, respect others, and accept responsibility? When talking about student values, we are talking about building a community that includes not only a sense of individual freedom, but a clear recognition of social responsibility.

V.

This leads to a fifth requirement. In creating a community with values, we must create a climate of *caring* on the campus, and the most obvious place to start is in the classroom. As I look back on all the great teachers that I had, the ones who really made a difference in my life were the ones who truly cared. The teachers who most influenced me knew their subjects, they knew their students, they had active learning in the classroom, but just as important, they really *cared*. They not only taught their subjects, they taught themselves. The classroom affords the university the best place and opportunity to build an authentic, caring relationship with students, one that will engender the respect from students the university needs in order to assert in appropriate ways some authority over student conduct.

During the Carnegie study of campus life, the researchers who visited the community colleges returned with the strongest impressions of these institutions as successful, cohesive communities. How do they create such an environment? Their students are often older people, coming there for a short time, but these students find community in the *classroom*. As these midcareer people—often women—meet for an hour or two with a faculty member who really cares, meet with other students like themselves and share experiences, they make connections. They develop a sense of belonging. I concluded that it is not the length of time students spend on a campus, it is the quality of caring they find while they're there. So we should not be misled by the fact that many students spend all year or nine months on campus and believe that this makes a caring community where students feel they belong. More is required.

Caring occurs not only in the classroom. I am impressed that the support staff in higher education—perhaps more than any other sector of the academy—provides the caring that holds it all together. These are the people who are often the least honored. These are people who are the lowest paid, the least rewarded, seldom invited to a faculty celebration or an all-college meeting, and yet they are out there making the place work every single day. They may spend ten, twenty, or thirty years making the institution humane. It's unethical to take from them, to let them shoulder the responsibility for guiding students and giving bureaucracy a human face without acknowledging the role they play in creating a caring campus. I will mention in particular the residence hall supervisors, who respond to the most delicate concerns, personal crises, and emotional upheavals. These are the people who make a college or university a caring community.

Caring occurs not only in the classroom and on campus, but translates itself into service beyond the campus. Students in both high schools and colleges should be asked to engage in community service, to make a connection between what they learn and the realities of life. The campus should not be an isolated island, but a staging ground for action. Too many students hardly see beyond the campus, and don't see that what they are learning has relevance to life, and don't see people genuinely in need. The university should promote the value of translating the theory of the classroom into a sense of commitment and engagement. Martin Luther King, Jr., said that "everyone can be great, because everyone can serve." That is the essence of a caring community.

VI.

Finally, the spirit of community is shared through ceremonies, rituals, and traditions. Our lives take on deeper meaning as we recall the past and anticipate the future. In America today, people are inclined to live only in the present, to have little sense of where they have been or where they should be going. We find a breakdown of intergenerational connections; the young are disconnected from the old. Margaret Mead has written: "The continuity of all cultures depends on the living presence of at least three generations." In this view, the generations are connected to form a *vertical* culture, but in America we are creating a horizontal culture in which each age group communicates only with itself. Infants are in nurseries. Toddlers are in day care centers. School children are organized according to their birthdays. College students are isolated on campus. Adults are in the work place. And retirees increasingly live in retirement villages.

Even with these institutional separations, though, ways can be found to reconnect the generations. My mother and father for a time chose to live in a retirement village where the average age was eighty, but that place had a day care center, too. Every morning about fifty three- and four-year-olds came to visit, and every child had an adoptive grandparent. When I called my father he wouldn't talk about his aches and pains. Instead, he would talk about

his little friend. When I visited, I saw the child's drawings taped on the wall. That four-year-old was learning about the pains and the dignity of growing old, and my eighty-year-old father was inspired by the energy and curiosity of youth.

Our culture needs traditions and celebrations that allow people to connect across the generations and see themselves in a larger context. The most influential person in my life was my grandfather Boyer, who lived to be one hundred. At forty he moved his family to the inner city of Dayton, Ohio, and for forty years ran a little city mission. I was a child and didn't listen much to what he said in his sermons, but I saw the connections that he made with other people. That intergenerational bond in my own life taught me many values, including, perhaps most important, the value of serving others. I learned my own heritage growing up with three generations vitally interacting.

Student values are formed by inner quest and individual conscience. But student values are also formed by social context. They are defined by the quality of campus life, by all the elements that build a true community of learning. A college or university at its best is a *purposeful* community, which gives students loyalties larger than themselves. A college or university at its best is an *honest and open* community, which teaches empathy, integrity, and communication. A college or university is a *just* community, which teaches tolerance and respect for diversity but teaches also the human commonalities that bind us all together. It's a *caring* community, which reminds students that to be truly human, one must serve, and it's a *celebrative* community, which helps students respect the past, put their own lives into perspective, and plan for the future.

If we can create this community in higher education, we will engender in students the highest values.

Ernest L. Boyer is president of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Consistently noted as one of the nation's leading educators, *U.S. News and World Report* named him Educator of the Year in 1990. During the past decade he has been a senior fellow at the Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University; education columnist for the *London Times;* visiting fellow at Cambridge University; and Distinguished Fulbright scholar to India and Chile. Before joining The Carnegie Foundation in 1979, Dr. Boyer served as U.S. Commissioner of Education under President Carter.

Dr. Boyer received his Ph.D. from the University of Southern California and currently holds over 100 honorary degrees. His teaching career began in 1955 at Loyola University. He then moved to New York where, as chancellor of the State University of New York, he successfully negotiated the first undergraduate exchange program with the Soviet Union. Author of the widely acclaimed books, *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America* and *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America*, Dr. Boyer has also written a series of influential Carnegie reports on urban education, the core curriculum, campus life, the role of the professoriate, and school readiness.

Deeply committed to the arts, Dr. Boyer has been a member of the Saratoga Performing Arts Center and the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. Currently he is a director of the Lincoln Center and chairs the Center's Institute for the Arts in Education.

Learning From Simon's Rock

Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz
Smith College, Northampton, MA

Copyright, 1993: not to be reproduced without permission of author

On a day in mid December, I was working with colleagues on a letter to our college president to request that she not create a new judicial body to deal with bias incidents on campus, that our existing Civil Rights procedures both allowed for appropriate action and protected the freedom of speech and expression of students, when I heard the news. At nearby Simon's Rock College, a student shot and killed a professor and a student and wounded three others, one critically. Immediately I wanted to know more, for the week before I had met a dignified woman from Billings, Montana, with a son at Simon's Rock who told me her life story. My husband and I spoke with her as the three of us waited in a parlor of Northfield Mount Hermon while our children were having an admissions interview. Sadly I learned that the student with the semi-automatic rifle was Wayne Lo, the talented older son of the Mrs. Lo whom I had just met.

As the emotions of the day began to subside, I began to contrast the two events of the day. The work that had been interrupted by the news announcement had been provoked by a long-standing student controversy. In a dormitory, a student had said "Cream rises to the top, that's not racism, that's elitism" in a manner that suggested that she found certain African-American students at the bottom. Called before the student judicial board, she was told to write an apology. The seeming inadequacy of this penalty upset some students who had called for her expulsion from the college. In response, the college president spoke to many groups on campus and came up with a plan for a Bias Response Panel to deal with actions that fall within the law but that, as the official college newsletter put it, "dishonor cultural diversity." The panel was to have disciplinary powers. As a member of the committee who, working with the college's lawyer and trustee legal affairs committee, had recently drafted the college's freedom of speech and expression statement and civil rights procedures, I opposed giving this new panel powers to discipline, for it threatened to sweep away the careful and legally sound existing procedures that in my eyes balanced rights and community values.

At Simon's Rock, a student who had been declaiming for some time his hatred of Blacks, Jews, homosexuals, and intermarriage, had received in the mail a package from an ammunitions maker. A receptionist who signed for the package noted that it was from a firearms company and told college administrators. The latter discussed the matter for an hour and decided to deliver it and then inquire about it. Wayne Lo opened it in privacy, hid its contents, and lied to his residence director when she inquired what the package contained. Only when a phone call warned that the residence director and her family were targets, did the college move. Wayne Lo by this time had begun his shooting rampage.

What I am struck by in both instances is the dilemma of the college as it faces the contemporary situation. The courts have substantiated that in loco parentis died in the late 1960s. The college no longer stands as parent, able to use wide discretionary powers to discipline and punish students. The college has redefined itself as a civil community that goes by certain rights and procedures. The courts, however, tend to hold the college to a higher standard, requiring it to protect the safety of its members. In addition, many colleges feel a special responsibility to confront the insularity and racism of many students, to redefine for them culture and social structure. At this juncture, many colleges are restating the terms by which its members are to live in codes and in convocations, explicitly invoking values. I am not going to argue against this, it is needed work.

What I am going to insist is that we think about college values—especially those promoting social responsibility—in terms of a conversation that takes place in a special context. The conversation takes place between students and student affairs professionals, both shaped by distinctive subcultures. Many undergraduates live in a world in which they are shaped by undergraduate cultures that come from the past and that take specific form in the particular society of each college. Some deans are working from a professional stance that carries certain key assumptions.

It is my task to argue that as we consider college student values, we begin with knowledge of students as they are, not as we fancy them in our dreams and nightmares. We must think about the way that the articulation of values interacts with the worlds that students create on campus. To do so, we need to understand the historical origins of both student cultures and of the college officers designated to deal with them.

Let me look first at Smith College, which I know, first, as a historian, and second as a relatively new member of the faculty. Smith, founded in 1875, was by 1900 the largest college for women in the country, with over 2,000 students. Unlike other colleges, it housed its students in small units, both on campus and off. Its much vaunted cottage system sought to retain some of the spirit of a home, but in fact, created small-scale all female worlds. For the sake of economy, Smith chose not to house all students in college, but allowed half to live in boarding houses in the town, some of which became exclusive, joined only through invitation. Unlike other women's colleges, Smith began with very few rules. What emerged by 1910 was a college that was delightful if one came from the Protestant middle class elite, but was painful if one were a scholarship student, particularly studious, a Jew, or a black. Smith did not have sororities, but it managed to reproduce the female world of social exclusions in its cottages and boarding houses. Students tended to group only with their own kind and to shun anyone who was different.

In the 1920s, the college decided that it needed to house all students on campus to break the distinctions that were fostered by the private boarding houses. It built a large double quadrangle of ten dormitories, housing over 800 students. The Quad, as it is known, helped a great deal. But it didn't do everything. When I was looking for photographs for *Alma Mater*, I found one of the quad dormitory where my mother-in-law was a student in the early 1930s. There she is, a petite pretty young woman of 21 with the six friends that I had come to know since I joined the family, seven Jewish young women standing apart from the seventy or so others, as if there were an invisible wall surrounding them.

My guess is that today, sixty years later, some of the walls still exist. They don't separate Jew and Christian anymore; but they can separate others—lesbian and heterosexual, artistic and straight, prosperous and poor, black, Asian, Latino, and white, residence hall, and outsiders. The thirty-three small houses may be fostering a narrowness of spirit sharply at odds with the official values of a college which celebrates diversity. Smith has no sororities; I wonder if its dorms simulate their exclusionary spirit.

I've been told that in a Smith house, one student often does not confront another directly. The example given was of music playing on someone's stereo too loudly: an unhappy student did not walk down the hall to suggest turning the stereo down. She called security; and a security officer paid a call. In the case of one student insulting another by "cream rising to the top," those who heard her did not call her to account to her face but went to a dean to institute a judicial proceeding.

About Simon's Rock I speak with knowledge largely gleaned from local newspaper accounts. A small 1960s experimental college, it brings younger students, some of them high school juniors and seniors, to an idyllic campus in the Berkshires, offering them a junior college program in humanities and arts. Simon's Rock students are therefore somewhat younger than typical college students, and they are apt to be on the experimental edge, the kind of students that in other contexts would be rebels. When bullet shots were heard, one student, quoted in the newspaper, thought immediately: Wayne has got a gun. What this suggests is that students knew a great deal about their classmate, not just that he held ideas that were abhorrent, but that he held the potential to act on them. Somehow that knowledge did not get to the adults who served as his deans. Why not? I'm not certain of anything, but my guess is that Simon's Rock students acted as male collegians have done, at least since the late 18th century: they saw themselves as bound by a code not to talk to college authority. (This code has recently been turned into a positive, absolute value in the new film "The Scent of a Woman.") At Simon's Rock, the problems of group living that were exacerbated by heavy metal music and the imitation of skin heads were to be confronted face to face or endured silently. Unlike what appears to me to be happening at Smith, the students at Simon's Rock seem not to need lessons in coping with diversity or handling their own problems. The forces that drive them to the college probably tell them once they are there that they need to allow others to "do their own thing." Their Achilles heel was different. That Wayne Lo might be experiencing emotional problems, that the six-year passage from Taiwan to Simon's Rock via Billings, Montana, might be more than he could bear, probably did not occur to them. Or if it did, they were restrained by a peer culture that insists that one student doesn't rat on another.

The college has two policies, one at variance with the other. It has a policy against firearms. Newspaper statements by the dean clarify that it also has a firm ethic that students are adults and cannot be subjected to searches without their permission or their packages impounded. When put to the test, it chose to place the higher value on

one student's rights against the safety of others in the community. Smith College brings disciplinary proceedings against a student for saying "Cream rises to the top," and when the punishment is regarded as too light, faces turmoil on campus. Simon's Rock's undergraduates not only tolerate a student as he says whatever he wants against any group, college authorities allow him to receive a package from an arms manufacturer by mail and open it away from any supervision. However confused Wayne Lo was about other questions, he knew that he could count on other students not to talk to adults in the administration. He also guessed correctly that his dean and his residence director would respect his privacy and not turn to civil authorities.

What can we learn from Simon's Rock? I think that it can remind us that no rule, no rhetoric, no action takes place in a vacuum. It dramatizes for us that all discussions of college values need to be accompanied by an understanding of students as being located in particular undergraduate cultures. This culture mediates messages from presidents, chaplains, deans, members of the faculty, and each other. When a college makes a regulation, it must think about how that rule will be addressed at the other end. When you and I talk to students from behind a desk or a podium, we are not having a conversation with a mirror, we are rather seeking to talk with someone who sees us in particular ways, who interprets what we say from the vantage point not only of individual differences, but of a peer culture that may admire us, mock us, or ignore us. Moreover, we who do the talking are shaped in part by our professional cultures which help to define the way that we see students.

As a historian, I have looked at the worlds that undergraduates have made in two ways. In *Alma Mater*, I began with a particularistic approach, looking at the specific historical fabric of particular institutions to understand their peculiar convolutions. I then turned in *Campus Life* to attempt to define the way that undergraduates have, since the late 18th century, divided themselves into contending student cultures. I would like to bring some of this to bear into our discussion here at the Institute on College Student Values. It is my task less to discuss the communication of values than to raise questions about the problems of communication.

Let me talk to you first about *student cultures*. In entering college, freshmen step into a complex environment containing alternative student cultures, each with its own standards and values. These particular undergraduate worlds give form to students' lives and meaning to their experience. They compose a social order that, like the communities they are leaving, has emerged from an earlier time. The undergraduate cultures that today's students inherit have traditions dating from the late 18th century that shape the way those within them see their situation and act. I have argued that there are three primary traditions:

1. *College life* born in the violent revolts of the 18th and early 19th century. The Early Republic saw a wave of collective student uprisings, led by the wealthier and worldlier undergraduates. Pleasure-seeking young men who valued style and openly pursued ambition rioted against college presidents and faculty determined to put them in their place. The revolts were forcibly suppressed; but the conflict went underground. Collegians withdrew from open confrontation to turn to covert forms of expression. They forged a peer consciousness sharply at odds with that of the faculty and of serious students and gave it institutional expression in the fraternity and club system.

College life as it emerged in the male college of the 19th century was altogether agreeable to affluent male adolescents. In the competitive world of peers, *college men* could fight for position on the playing field and in the newsroom and learn the manly arts of capitalism. As they did so, they indulged their love of rowdiness and good times in ritualized violence and sanctioned drinking. Classes and books existed as the price one had to pay for college life, but no right-thinking college man worried about marks beyond the minimum needed to stay in the game. Faculty and students faced each other across the trenches. If cheating were needed to win the battle, no shame inhered in the act. No real college man ever expected to learn in the classroom, not at least the kind of knowledge that bore any relation to his future life in the world. No, college life taught the real lessons; and from it came the true rewards.

To protect themselves from the demands of faculty, college men attempted to define a reasonable amount of academic work. They perceived the especially diligent student as the "grind" and the student seeking faculty friendship as the "fisherman" or "brown-nose." This effort was necessary because college life has always had to contend with a significant number of students who have wanted no part of it—*the outsiders*.

2. The initial outsiders were those for whom higher education was intended, those studying for the ministry. The future ministers avoided the hedonism and violence of their rowdy classmates. Studious, polite, and respectful of authority, these hard-working students sought the approval of their teachers, not of their peers. When the fraternities formed, these students stood outside. College was for them not a time for fun, but of preparation for a profession. They focused on academic, not extracurricular,

success; sought the approval of their teachers; and hoped that achievement in the future would compensate for the trials of the present.

Beginning in the mid-nineteenth century other outsiders took the pastors' places: ambitious youth from all over rural America; the first college women; immigrants, especially Jews; blacks; veterans after World War II; commuters; and, beginning in the 1960s, women continuing their education.

3. Gaining an education from the curriculum was not to be limited to outsiders. Beginning in 1910, a few rebellious collegians directly challenged traditional college life and called it false and exclusive. College rebels claimed both the politics of the broader society and the intellectual commitments of the faculty. Excited by ideas, college rebels could be as cavalier about grades or as hedonistic as a college man, for they did not see their four college years as instrumental to future success. College rebels demanded the content, not the form. They fought the social distinctions that sorted out college students and reveled in difference not uniformity. They began to battle with college men for positions on student government and undergraduate newspapers. Beginning in 1920s, *college rebels* divided into two streams. Some students of an independent cast of mind withdrew from political discourse to struggle for inner psychic freedom. Others continued their openly political fights to link questions on campus to broader national issues.

4. *Women*: The first women to go to college were as serious and aspiring as any male outsider. Many had only the diffuse wish to continue study, but some looked to school teaching as their future profession. At the all-female schools such as Vassar College, they had a chance to define themselves on their own terms. The more outgoing created a robust college life. independent and hedonistic, but their college life did not incorporate male hostility to the faculty or disinterest in study; they did not cheat. Within a community of women, they competed in athletics or ran for offices in campus organizations and learned new skills which took them beyond the canons of feminine behavior and into reform causes of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Coeducational institutions: They began as outsiders, but second generation of coeds attracted more affluent and conventional women college at the end of the nineteenth century. These students found a way to get partly inside: they created the Borority world that allied them with male power on campus. Conservative and cautious, sororities insisted on social distinctions and feminine behavior. Less affluent women or those with intellectual ambitions remained outsiders. The more free-wheeling joined male rebels and entered the political fray.

II.

A conversation about values has two sides. I have given you my perspective on one, outlining the formation of student cultures. Now let me explore the other by looking at the historical formation of the office of the dean of students. In the 1910s when it was born, there was across the nation a debate being waged about college experience in speeches and essays. There were many new reforms being tried. Behind this controversy was the nineteenth century revolution in knowledge and the way it was organized which fundamentally reshaped higher education. At its most basic level, the college and university saw the introduction of the scientific method and this set off a wave of curricular change. In its wake, educators looked at the larger education of undergraduates and found it wanting. Some set out to reshape the curriculum, giving us our first humanities programs, the system of majors and minors, and colleges committed to general education. Today I want to look not at that aspect, but a related effort at change, the one that worked at the other end to reshape college life.

The problem that they saw was how to motivate the student? Those who attempted to reshape undergraduate experience were less interested in the question of what an educated person ought to know than in an even more rudimentary one. They focused on the college man, ignoring the outsider, and asked the question: How can we get the undergraduate to have any interest in knowing at all?

There was widespread belief that something was wrong in American higher education: bright young men were wasting their opportunities. In colleges and universities split between college men, outsiders, and rebels, the best and the brightest were satisfied with the gentleman C. Woodrow Wilson, the president at Princeton, saw the college men as "the natural leaders and doers," "the finer, more spirited, more attractive, more original and more effective" students on campus. But in their engagement in athletics and activities, these college men were essentially lost to the fundamental purposes of the college, which was, in Wilson's mind, "the association of men, young and old, for serious mental endeavor and also, in the intervals of work, for every wholesome sport and diversion." College men could be made to study and perform on examinations, but their spirits were elsewhere. As Wilson put it, "The side shows are so numerous, so diverting, so important, if you will, that they have swallowed up the circus, and those who perform in the main tent must

often whistle for their audiences, discouraged and humiliated." Yes, colleges had scholars. Wilson recognized the serious student, the one I have called the outsider, who kept "modestly to his class-room and his study." But these young men stayed outside the game and thus remained "withdrawn and ineffectual."

There were a number of efforts to deal with this, some commendable, some terrible. This is the period that saw the creation of the house system, a quota placed on Jews, the cultivation of serious intellectual life at Swarthmore, the creation of Reed College, and an effort at the University of Wisconsin to develop a fusion of education and campus life. I want to talk about the main approach, however, the one that has shaped college experience in the twentieth century. It has been something more modest: the effort to harness college life and make it serve institutional purposes.

College life began in rebellion and was institutionalized in the fraternity. it was at odds with the central purposes of the colleges. But in the 1910s and 1920s the administrators of most colleges and universities came to an accommodation with college life. They assumed it to be normal. They saw its longterm benefits. Alumni with fond memories of college days emerged to endow alma mater. Football games cultivated undergraduate loyalty, especially when the school had winning teams. Moreover, the codes of college life—however hostile to the academic enterprise—served to govern student behavior. As colleges and universities grew to a larger size, their administrators perceived the value of communal order, even one patrolled by students. The trick was to harness college life, to limit its hedonism and more destructive elements, and to emphasize its relation to citizenship and service.

Colleges created student governments whose officers were elected by undergraduates. The official college thereby gave recognition to the students' own system of prestige. Its purpose however, was not to empower college leaders, but to foster communication with them and to co-opt them. Self-government normally meant that while undergraduates might give opinions and advise, they could not make the rules, or at least not the important ones. In return for office, heads of college government were given the responsibility for influencing their following, and, where there were student courts, for acting as judge and jury. Student government was part of the effort to harness college life to official ends.

Colleges created a new job. Quite early on a number of institutions enlisted specific members of the faculty to supervise students' manners and morals. New coeducational universities, such as the University of Chicago, felt a need for a prominent woman to oversee female students, founding the office of Dean of Women. When the University of Chicago opened, President William Rainey Harper appointed Alice Freeman Palmer, former president of Wellesley College, to the position. In 1901, the University of Illinois established the position of Dean of Men with the appointment of Thomas Arkle Clark, who became the legendary undergraduate dean. By 1930 a textbook on college administration assumed that in a college of more than three hundred, a dean existed to supervise the non-academic life of students and to advise and inspire them. The dean "is assumed to be competent to give advice on almost any phase of a student's life from the choice of a vocation or life mate to the selection of the best shoe store or haberdashery in town." The deans' most important task was to make college life compatible with the administration's goals. Working with student leaders, they helped plan and coordinate student activities.

The sharp distinctions that had once existed between the official college and college life disappeared. As students sat on disciplinary councils and deans crowned homecoming queens, the two seemed to be partners in promoting the good of the school and in developing school spirit. By the 1920s, college life —while still hedonistic and hostile to intellect — had lost much of its oppositional stance.

As colleges and universities harnessed and co-opted college life, the particular institutions and traditions of a segment of the student body became established as the official institutions and traditions of the college. Just as athletic teams came inside under coaches who belonged to the faculty, so did other elements of the extracurriculum. Yearbooks, once the preserve of particular clubs, evolved into official student yearbooks. Secret societies emerged as honor societies, their tap days campus-wide occasions. Male singing groups that had hired local musicians to aid them became college choral societies led by members of the music faculty. Their songs became the college's songs. "Service" and "community" took on a particular coloration —it was service to the college, as defined by the big men and women on campus.

What this means for our conversation about college values is that students divided into subcultures were talking to administrators who tended to see them as essentially all alike. The new office of dean of students did not recognize the variety of ways that undergraduates experienced college, the range of campus cultures. This is because it valorized the college way. In most institutions the office of dean of students accepted the Greek system and saw its students as the backbone of the college.

Outsiders were simply those to be brought into college life with more effective planning. Rebels were troublesome and to be confined. Success of a dean could be measured by degree of participation in college activities. To some degree, today's deans of students partake of this historically-created world.

III.

As I turn to thinking about the contemporary conversation between deans and students about values I realize that I may lose my audience. For it is my contention that the campus world that began to emerge in the 1970s and continues to today has been dominated by the culture of the New Outsiders. Let me briefly state what I mean. Beginning in the 1970s, students took to their books and began a period in their history that has persisted in some form now for over two decades. Undergraduates responded with a vengeance to the message that they make high grades for medical and law school. They wondered if there was anything for them in fraternity life or political action groups. The corrosive effect of this question decimated the ranks of collegians and rebels. Beginning in the 1970s, the culture of the outsiders triumphed over the ethos of college men and women and rebels. But what had once been the province of aspiring youth, optimistic about their futures, became that of prosperous collegians fearful of downward social mobility.

The New Outsiders have transformed the campus. Students who in other eras would have become college men and women now act like outsiders in the past, they must focus on professors not peers and seek to succeed in the classroom. To do so they employ all the strategies that college men once imagined outsiders pursued. Despite their seriousness, today's New Outsiders do not connect to the life of the mind: ideas are far too risky in the game of grade-seeking that they play. Holding themselves in as carefully as did high school students in the past, these undergraduates fail to follow individual interests that might lead them to find true vocations or to develop autonomy from parental standards. They work for a grade, for the cumulative grade point average that will get them into law school. There is a major difference between the new and the old outsiders. For the New Outsiders the war between students and faculty is not really over. It has only gone under deeper cover.

Boundaries between student groups remain permeable, and thus the ethos of the New Outsider shapes those who currently choose to be college men and women or rebels. The fear of economic and social erosion, of not being able to reproduce the comfortable world of one's parents, continues to dominate undergraduate consciousness.

The pressure that students feel to make the grade has fed a mean-spirited atmosphere on many campuses, as young people see themselves competing for increasingly scarce goods. Much of what seems like racism on campus is provoked by a belief that membership in a minority group brings advantages, ones that will be critical to job-seeking outside college gates. Once again, students seek ways of asserting their status, leading some of them to flaunt wealth and privilege. As the formal part of college has become increasingly fraught with anxiety, undergraduates seek play that is mindless release.

Let me be clear that there are today alternative cultures for students—college life remains available for some, and rebellion for others. Secondly, to describe a subculture's message is not to describe an individual student. Students partake only to a certain degree of their peer world's ethos; they have other impulses, other pressures. However, having said this, I want to emphasize that to the degree that students assume the attitudes of the campus culture that is predominant today, they take on a deeply oppositional posture to their faculty. They mediate what the professor says in and out of class through the lens of their peer culture. They have their own code. For them their grade point average is the bank account. Each term they deposit another set of grades. How they judge themselves depends on the size of the deposit and the closeness of their total to a 4.0. (If you don't believe this, ask a student to tell you her/his GPA. I've not met one yet that had not calculated it to at least two decimals.)

To make the grade, they are involved in serious negotiations in the classroom. They engage their professors in a game of grade-seeking and learn the appropriate behaviors: finding out the professor's point of view, learning to get her/him to tell what is on the exam, being sure that one's name is known by showing up for office hours before the first exam, etc.

And what of the influences out of class? Michael Moffatt's fascinating work has shown us a dormitory culture of undergraduates, centered in personal relationships and sexual experimentation. Young people living together, removed from the supervision of adults, devise their own ways of interacting and their own implicit codes. That these young people are involved in getting an education is distant and peripheral to the real experience of living on their own. Although some of them are honors students, they bring into their conversation and play no questions of meaning and value remotely connected to their intellectual effort. Their two worlds are like magnets turned to repulse not attract each other. Academics generate pressure; outside the students seeks release, a break, blow-out.

Given the earlier history of the relation between student life personnel and campus life, there has been an effort to turn the New Outsiders to altruism and public service. Colleges not only work with fraternities and sororities to get them to involve themselves in philanthropic activities, they have begun to let students know that it is their own interest, either to graduate or to build a resume, to perform some volunteer service. This has filtered down into the high school where students are encouraged to present a service activity to college admissions officers. While nothing is wrong with either encouraging Greek societies to have service components or telling students it is their interest to work for the larger social good, I am skeptical about the long-term value of both approaches. Like much of classroom learning, that which can be turned on can be turned off when it is no longer required.

IV.

I have stated my case for a recognition of contending student cultures on campus. I have considered the formation of the position of dean of students, and have attempted to characterize today's students. These are broad strokes. To be at all useful to any individual campus, they must be filled in. This is something that I cannot do — and each of you must do yourself — that is to place these big categories in the context of the particulars of each individual college or university with its unique history and particular social structure.

I have stressed this because some of the most influential work on student values took place in a unique context in which the issues that I have addressed did not hold. The pioneer work was done on Bennington, an admirable college, but one that was sui generis. Bennington was a new women's college, without college traditions, that attracted a young, sophisticated male faculty. Students as they went through the classes did tend to be influenced by their professors: each class got successively more liberal, approaching the politics of the faculty. But in this world, the faculty were at the top of the pecking order. As freshmen came to Bennington they faced a status system that had faculty on top, bright seniors who associated with them next, and then down the imitating classes. In no other college were students so vulnerable to professorial influence. This work generated certain assumptions about the absorption of faculty and administrators' values by students that have distorted our thinking to this day.

A more typical college is Rutgers. It is important to see the way that deans appear in Michael Moffatt's study: they are distant, somewhat annoying figures. When they make statements at the orientation at the outset or move to abolish the game-like ritual "Secret Santa" midway, students look at them slant-eyed, far readier to mock or carp than to listen or believe. Students are not absorptive sponges. They are tennis rackets that whack the ball back into the server's court.

This is the context in which I want you to think about college values. My own view is that for collegiate community to focus meaningfully on values, it must do so as a conversation between actors self-conscious about the subcultures that shape their consciousness. Both sides enter a conversation not just as individuals but as participants in cultures that have ways of rephrasing what the other says. If Simon's Rock has lessons to teach it is that it is not enough to articulate issues of diversity and citizenship, we need to foster communication between students and their deans and teachers that first recognizes and then breaks through the old molds.

You will notice that I have from the outset spoken of values as a conversation. I don't think, however, that everything is up for grabs. There are, I think, certain givens:

1. Rules. Each campus needs to set some rules—such as no firearms on campus—that set clear limits to students' behavior to protect the safety of all. I do think that it is important that a college have only the rules it is willing to enforce. The legal responsibility of colleges to protect the safety of members of its community require this.

2. First amendment protections. Courts have made it clear that college authorities cannot say to students "wash out your mouth." More importantly, in an educational community, the first amendment fosters a necessary condition: free discussion. The way to fight speech is with more speech.

3. First amendment protections also insist on something that I find congruent with my own basic principles: judge a person by their acts not by their beliefs. The rules that we establish must limit behaviors not attitudes.

Within these guidelines, when we attempt to consider values, when we in the words of the call for this institute, attempt to promote altruism, service, citizenship — caring and social responsibility, we need to do so not by fiat or dictum but through extended conversations, conversations that cross the range of student subcultures.

I clearly said conversation, not preaching. Except in a voluntary situation, such as a worship service or an optional lecture that a student chooses to attend, I think that it is counterproductive to tell students what they

should believe and feel. We are a profoundly divided culture. Our goal must be to create a forum for interaction. On our campuses—so fractured by divisions among us—political as well as racial and economic—we must create a civil community in which we can come together, talk, and disagree.

Finally, just as we should judge students by their acts not their beliefs, so may they judge us. The best way that the college can communicate values is by its representatives living them. Colleges and universities can be cut-throat places; they can deal with students dishonestly and deceitfully. They can be bureaucratic places that turn students into numbers and refuse to consider their individual issues. If we subvert by deed what we are espousing in word we harm the development of student values all the more.

My own guess is that I, as a faculty member, have a somewhat different slant than someone who is a dean or a chaplain. When I think about college student values, I think about it as a part of the educational task of higher education. I want a conversation about values because I want students involved as engaged participants. I have studied college life not only because it fascinates me but also because I want to break through the stock responses that it engenders to the young men and women underneath.

Let me close by giving you one illustration of an effort to teach community values that went wrong. At a small eastern university, a group of students stopped bussing their trays at dinner. The university did not initiate a conversation, it slapped a fine on all students to pay for the additional kitchen help required. The university had hoped that peer pressure would force the offenders to become good citizens. That is not what happened. The original no-bussers were not students that their peers wanted to mess with. The $25 fine on all students seemed unfair to those who had bussed their trays. So, as a result of the fine a much larger number of students stopped bussing their trays. As they put it, they were paying for it so why do the work. When I was there to study the campus culture, I found that by 8 p.m. the large round tables in the college dining room had towers of trays four and five feet high as successive waves of students ate dinner and pushed their trays to the center. I watched as an employee got up on a ladder and gradually unstacked the trays and climbed down and took them to the kitchen. Since then these towers of trays have become a vivid metaphor for me of communications between administrators and students gone awry.

Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz is professor of history and American studies at Smith College. She received a B.A. in history from Wellesley College and master's and doctoral degrees in American civilization from Harvard. She has been a Smithsonian Fellow in American and Cultural History, fellows of the National Humanities Center and the Rockefeller Foundation, chair of the Program for the Study of Women and Men in Society and professor of history at the University of Southern California. Dr. Horowitz has taught at Scripps College, Claremont Graduate School, Union College, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard.

Dr. Horowitz's numerous publications include the book, *Campus Life: Undergraduate Cultures from the End of the Eighteenth Century to the Present.* She is presently writing a biography of M. Carey Thomas, president of Bryn Mawr College and feminist, 1857-1935. Her article, "Why So Many Students Today Are Grinds," together with "Introduction: As Professors View Students," appear in the collection, *Points of View on American Higher Education: A Selection of Essays from The Chronicle of Higher Education.*

Promoting Social Responsibility: A Challenge for Higher Education

Alexander Astin
Director, Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA

Since the late 1960s our national surveys of college freshman have revealed dramatic changes in student values. Among other things, making more money has become much more important to America's young people than it had been before. And students, more than ever, have come to see college primarily as a way to enhance earnings and to get jobs. These instrumental or materialistic trends showed up in every category of student regardless of gender, ethnicity, or social class. While we in the Academy might be tempted to stand back and self righteously deplore these changes in societal values with the myriad social problems we see around us, I think we're all too prone to forget in academia two basic realities about the values that drive our institutions. First is the fact that, perhaps unwittingly, we've become an active participant in the societal competitiveness and materialism that shows up our students. Second, and more important, is the fact that we possess tremendous untapped potential, not only for restoring a better balance in societal values, but also for alleviating some of our most critical and urgent social problems like crime, illiteracy, poverty, urban blight, and environmental degradation. I believe the key to unlocking this great potential of our system is to face up to our own value dilemmas.

Most colleges and universities operate according to two sets of values. We have the formal or official institutional goals and values which are usually stated in our charter, mission statement, or catalog. These formal values can be regarded as an expression of our *explicit* values. These are the values that we and our academic colleagues pay lip service to. The other set of values is the one that really drives our policies. These are the values that underlie decisions such as how to allocate resources, how we hire and reward faculty and administrators, how and why we admit students, the way we establish our curriculum, the choice of pedagogical techniques, the establishment of new programs, procedures, and so on. I like to call these our *implicit* values. I believe we create enormous problems for ourselves when there are inconsistencies, and there are very serious ones, between our explicit and implicit values, or, if you prefer, between our words and our deeds.

Identifying our explicit values is a relatively simple task, since most of us have a formal charter or mission statement that embraces the familiar triad of teaching, research, and service. The really tough challenge, of course, is to find out how to expose our implicit values so we can discuss and scrutinize them. I found a handy strategy for doing this: talk about the issue of academic *quality* or academic *excellence*. Since most academics are strongly attached to the notion that excellence in education is a good thing, it becomes possible to expose these values by seeing how we go about trying to become excellent. While we all like to talk about excellence, the real question is what do we do in its name, and it's here that our implicit values come into play.

For several years now I've been arguing that we have traditionally defined excellence in higher education in two different ways. The two most popular methods are the "reputational" method, which is focused on what other people think of us, that is, where do we stand in the "reputational pecking order" that's so much a part of our mythology in American culture? This institutional pecking order is very stratified, very rigid, and very predictable over time. So we try to raise ourselves up in that pecking order. The higher we become, the more excellent we are, presumably. The other method of defining excellence is the "resources" method, which is concerned with what we've got, our possessions, how many smart students we have, National Merit finalists, how much money we have in our endowment and, in particular, how prestigious our faculty is, how much they publish, and how they get rated when the National Academy of Sciences does ratings of graduate programs. *Those* are our resources, and such resources make us excellent.

I've been railing against these two traditional ways of approaching excellence for a long time now, arguing that they really don't address our fundamental mission of teaching, service to students, service to the community, and service to the public. I've been characterizing the teaching mission in terms of the "talent development" conception of excellence, where we are

excellent if we develop the talents of our students; and serve our community and our society. Whether we will ever come around to embracing the talent development approach fully remains to be seen.

The resources and reputational approach reflect materialistic values, but they are also manifestations of a *competitive* view of excellence, a competitive view of education where our institution competes with others for finite resources of bright students, prestigious faculty, and money, and for higher and higher places in the reputational pecking order. Of course, resources and reputation are mutually enhancing in the sense that if you have a good reputation, you can bring in resources, and if you have a lot of resources, it enhances your reputation. The talent development concept, on the other hand, reflects more of a *cooperative* value perspective, in the sense that we see our institution as working together with the student to enhance the student's talents and to help students realize their goals and ambitions. We are also working with the community and society for their betterment as well.

A less charitable way of looking at these implicit values of resource acquisition and reputational enhancement is that they reflect a kind of institutional narcissism, where our sense of excellence and self-worth is defined in terms of either our material possessions or what others think of us. Our explicit values of teaching and public service, on the other hand, are more transcendent values in the sense that the realization of these values requires us to transcend our institutional egos and to identify ourselves in terms of how effectively we educate our students and serve the public interest. I think the key to unlocking the full potential of our higher education systems ultimately will depend on our ability to find some way to transcend our institutional egos and to bring our implicit values more closely in line with our explicit mission and values.

These arguments have been pretty much on a theoretical level for a couple of decades, but we now have some empirical evidence to support these arguments about different approaches to excellence and institutional values. What I would like to do is abstract some findings from this new study that will shed some light on this whole issue of how student values are influenced by institutional values. The present study involved a large national sample of students, 217 institutions, 25,000 undergraduates, and the entire faculty and academic administration of these 217 institutions. We assessed the students when they entered as freshmen and then followed them up four and half years later. We also got their test scores and related information, so it was a data base of unprecedented quality and comprehensiveness. The study was designed to determine how a variety of student outcomes are affected by the student's undergraduate experience, which would include such things as the kind of institutional values to which the student was exposed. We had a total of 82 different outcome measures, including a variety of cognitive and affective outcomes that were judged to be relevant to the goals of a liberal or general education. When you look at the literature on liberal education or general education, just about anything you can imagine is alleged to be a goal of general education. We controlled for more that 140 characteristics of each student at the point of entry as a freshman and also studied the effects of some 190 environmental characteristics, including institutional values.

Some of these student outcomes, for example, included personal values such as student materialism. The literature on general education says that one of our goals is to discourage students from taking a materialistic view of life and of education. So a negative impact on materialism would presumably be a desirable effect. Another value was social activism, that is, how much the student invests in trying to bring about positive social change. Also included was a very specific value of promoting racial understanding, and a value that's been a favorite of ours—"developing a meaningful philosophy of life." We call this our "existential" value. We also had some behavioral measures, for example, performing volunteer service and voting as a measure of citizenship.

A few examples of institutional values would be how oriented toward students the institution is, and whether or not they care about students, how strongly oriented they are towards research, how much they emphasize the acquisition of resources or the enhancement of reputation, and how much they emphasize the development of community.

Perhaps the most important generalization derived from this massive study is that the most powerful single source of influence on students' cognitive and affective development appears to be the *peer group*. The characteristics of the peer group and the extent of students' interaction with that peer group have enormous potential for influencing virtually all aspects of the students' educational and personal development. Generally speaking, the greater the interaction with peers, the more favorable the outcome. The results also provide strong support for a theory we've developed over the years called the theory of *involvement*. This comes out of my clinical psychology background. It's similar to the Freudian concept of cathexis, referring to the investment of psychic energy and physical time and energy in something outside of yourself. The greater that investment, the greater the learning, and the greater the personal development. We also found that

faculty did matter too. And in general, the same principle applies—the more interaction with faculty, the better.

Also of interest in these findings were some value-related outcomes associated with student participation in community service activities. We asked students not only whether they participated in such activities, but how much time they spent (how involved they were) in such activities and treated this as a outcome measure from our follow-up. The results are rather distressing. We categorized students into three groups: frequent participants, occasional participants and those who participated not at all. The figures indicate a huge drop in the rate in which students participate in service activities between high school and college. There's more than a 50% drop. Frequent participants in high school are much more likely to be frequent participants in college than the non-participants from high school (16 versus 6 percent). They are also twice as likely, almost, to be occasional participants in college (45 versus 26). Another way of looking at this is to realize that of the frequent participants, 39 percent don't participate at all in college. We're losing, in other words, forty percent of our frequent participants between high school and college. The point of this is that there's a lot of potential here based upon what students did in high school that we're not developing at the postsecondary levels. This information sets the stage for further examining how the college environment encourages or discourages volunteerism.

As it turns out, we found a variety of influences related to such things as the curriculum, the faculty, the peer group, the type of institution and individual student activities. For example, taking interdisciplinary courses or majoring in social science or education appears to enhance student involvement in volunteer service while in college. Given the emphasis in education and in many of the social sciences on social and public policy issues, this shouldn't be a surprising result. Why interdisciplinary courses should be related to voluntary participation, however, isn't entirely clear, although it's interesting to realize that, with few exceptions, most volunteer assignments are probably multidisciplinary in nature. It may well be that some of these interdisciplinary courses involve fieldwork assignments.

As far as faculty influences are concerned, we find an interesting parallel to the entering student characteristics. Just as people who were social activists in high school are likely to be volunteers in college, so it appears that faculty who are strongly committed to social change are successful in promoting greater student participation in volunteer activities. In those institutions where the faculty are more committed to social change, we see a higher-than-expected rate of participation, the expected rate being based on their high school levels of participation.

Perhaps the most significant finding of all concerns the peer group effect. Of all the variables in our study, by far the largest effect on volunteerism is associated with the frequency of interaction among students. Those students who are most likely to participate in volunteer work are the ones who interact most frequently with their peers. This finding suggests that one promising way to encourage greater student participation in volunteer activities is simply to maximize the amount of interaction that occurs among students.

The significance of this finding becomes even clearer when we look at some of the factors that have negative consequences for volunteer participation. The peer group characteristic that has the largest negative effect on volunteer participation is the degree of involvement of the peer group in outside work. This is not the individual's outside work, which would obviously detract from one's ability to spend time in volunteer work. That was controlled for in the study. This is the *peer group* effect. So whatever your propensity to be a volunteer or not when you enter, if a large proportion of your peers are engaged in outside work activities, your odds of participating in volunteer work are reduced. Other individual student activities that are negatively associated with volunteer participation include living at home, which of course would draw you away from the peer group, and watching television. If you wanted to do one thing for undergraduates that would enhance their development across all areas, it would be to pull the plug on the television set. It has an incredible amount of negative consequences. The only "positive" effect of watching television is to strengthen materialistic values.

Further support for the importance of student peer group relations can be found by looking at those individual student activities that have positive effects on volunteer student participation. Participation in religious activities, involvement in campus activism of all kinds (e.g., demonstrations, protests and that kind of thing) and socializing with members of different ethnic groups. The more interaction across racial lines we find, the more favorable we find student development turns out to be. It's also of interest to note that the amount of interaction between faculty and students also had one of its strongest effects on volunteer participation. This is interesting because some of the reports on educational reform that came out in the 1980's directed at higher education talked a lot about student-faculty interaction. Here's just one more benefit to be derived from this type of interaction.

As far as the type of institution is concerned, Roman Catholic colleges appear to facilitate involvement in volunteer work. *Being* Roman Catholic at the time of entry to college is also a positive predictor of participation in volunteer work. Both of these variables carry significant weight. Catholics *and* non-Catholics are more likely to become involved in volunteer work if they attend Catholic colleges, but Catholics who attend non-Catholic institutions are still more likely to participate in volunteer work than their non-Catholic peers.

Our study also provides us with an excellent opportunity to understand some of the factors that contribute to an individual institution's commitment to community service. We had a measure of the degree of commitment the institution had toward "serving society," based on our faculty survey. We aggregated the results at each institution and got sort of a consensus of the faculty's opinion about how committed the institution was to this value. There were remarkable variations among our 217 institutions in the extent to which the institutions were perceived as being committed to community service.

What other characteristics of institutions are associated with a higher or low priority being given to facilitating student involvement in community service? First, let's look at the positive correlates. The strongest positive correlate of an institutional commitment to community service is the extent to which the faculty has, as a personal goal, to help students understand and examine their own personal values. Community service and serving others is a value-based concept. Whether you want to define it behaviorally or not doesn't matter. An institution committed to this kind of goal is one where the faculty themselves are committed to helping students understand their own personal values. Another equally strong correlate is the extent to which the institution is seen as aspiring to develop a sense of community among the students. Finally, another strong correlate is the goal to create a positive undergraduate experience for students.

In short, we have a complex of value measures which included service to others, self understanding, sense of community, and a positive undergraduate experience. These attributes tend to be found together in certain American higher education institutions.

Some other positive correlates with student involvement in community service are faculty commitment to the welfare of the institution, faculty accessibility to students during office hours, faculty accessibility to students outside of office hours, and faculty sensitivity to issues of ethnicity and minorities. Now what about the faculty's personal values for themselves? We find commitment to promoting racial understanding, to developing a meaningful philosophy of life, to influencing social values, and to helping others in difficulty. All of these value qualities tend to be found together and focus around facilitating student involvement in community service.

What kinds of institutions have a relatively weak commitment to facilitating community service? Faculty of these institutions believe that the administration is indifferent to students, that students are treated like numbers in a book, that there is little contact between faculty and students, that the curriculum suffers from faculty over-specialization, and that there is a lack of trust between minority students and administration. The only personal value of the faculty that produced a substantial negative relationship with this community service value was the importance that faculty attributed personally to obtaining recognition from others. However, the emphasis of the institution on *acquisition of resources and enhancement of reputation* was the single strongest negative correlate of facilitating student involvement in community service activities.

Given these patterns of positive and negative correlates, it's not surprising that there are differences by type of institution in the priorities assigned to facilitating student involvement in community service. Both types of public institutions, the four-year colleges and especially the universities, tend to be perceived by their faculties as having a weak commitment to student involvement in community service. I think it is ironic that the *public* institutions (we're talking here about *public* service) have the environments with the weakest emphasis on this value, whereas faculty in private four-year colleges report a much higher priority being given to involving students in community service. The private universities have an average level of commitment.

Is it possible that the low level of commitment found in public institutions is attributable to their larger size, that is, is it just an artifact of size and bureaucracy? We conducted a series of multi-variate analyses that showed that size is indeed a factor. But even after controlling for the effects of size, we still find a substantially lower level of commitment in the public institution. Another interesting finding is that the selectivity of the institution has a negative correlation with the priority given to involving students in volunteer work. In other words, once we control for the type and the size of the institution, the more selective institutions have the lower level of commitment.

Any attempt to promote volunteerism among students will be more likely to succeed if it is based on some

understanding of the students' goals and values. And as I've already mentioned, we've been witnessing some rather dramatic changes in these values. Some of the most sweeping changes have occurred in career choices. Increases in the values of materialism, power, status, and competitiveness have been accompanied by increased student interests in business careers, decreasing student interest in altruism, and societal problems, accompanied by decreased interest in teaching careers and all of the other human service occupations. However, there has been in the last six years a precipitous drop in student interest in business. At the same time, the values that have undergone these dramatic changes have shown a little bit of a reversal. The goal of being very well-off financially has basically traded places with the goal of developing a meaningful philosophy of life so that making money is now the top goal. But in the last few years there has been a bit of a reversal.

During the past few years, we've also seen a marked increase in student propensity toward social activism. It's especially interesting that the rate of activism is even greater among today's students than it was in the late sixties. That we may be witnessing a resurgence of student social concern and activism is further supported by other trends. Student commitment both to influencing social values and to influencing the political structure has shown a sharp increase during the past six years. Again, these data suggest that students are becoming increasingly unhappy with the status quo, and that there is a rapidly expanding group of potential activists entering higher education institutions. In addition, this year we saw a dramatic increase in the percentage of students who were willing to commit themselves to promoting racial understanding. This was one of the sharpest one-year changes in any value we've ever observed. We have to attribute some of this to the Los Angeles riots. I don't see any other alternative. It was just a remarkable jump in student commitment across all racial and ethnic groups. I think the lesson here, considering these value changes that we've been seeing the last few years, is clear. We are witnessing a rapidly increasing pool of student talent and energy that might well be channeled into productive involvement in community service.

Now I would like to discuss one other interesting piece of our study which adds something to the dialogue on the issues of political correctness, diversity, and multiculturalism. The study incorporated three types of environmental measures that relate directly to the issue of diversity and multiculturalism. We had a measure called "Institutional Diversity Emphasis," one called "Faculty Diversity Orientation," and then we had a number of measures of the individual student's direct experience with diversity issues. Institutional Diversity Emphasis, for example, reflects institutional priorities such as increasing the number of minority faculty, increasing the number of minority students, creating a diverse multicultural environment, increasing the number of women faculty, and developing an appreciation for multiculturalism. Faculty Diversity Orientation was defined in terms of whether faculty incorporated readings on women and gender issues in their courses, whether or not they incorporated readings on racial and ethnic issues in their courses, whether or not their research and writing focused on issues of women or gender, and whether their research focused on racial or ethnic minority issues. Note that Faculty Diversity Orientation is based on the faculty's own behavior (scholarly and pedagogical activities), while Institutional Diversity Emphasis reflects their perceptions of institutional priorities.

Student diversity experiences were measured in terms of how many ethnic study courses they took, how many women's studies courses they took, whether or not they attended racial and cultural awareness workshops, the frequency with which they discussed racial and ethnic issues with other students, and the frequency with which they socialized with people from other racial and ethnic groups. Each of these five activities was studied separately.

The effects of Institutional Diversity Emphasis are of some practical as well as theoretical interest, since the factors that make up this measure are presumably under the direct control of the institution and have direct policy significance. Institutional Diversity Emphasis has its strongest positive effects on two student outcomes: cultural awareness and commitment to promoting racial understanding. Cultural awareness is one of the developmental outcomes that was identified as particularly relevant to the goals of general education. It's based on the student's estimate of how much their undergraduate experience has enhanced their understanding and appreciation of other races and cultures. The fact that a strong emphasis on diversity enhances the student's commitment to promoting racial understanding is of special interest given that some of the "political correctness" critics have alleged that emphasizing issues such as race and multiculturalism tends to exacerbate racial tensions. Quite the opposite seems to be the case. Emphasizing matters of diversity seems to strengthen the student's personal commitment for promoting understanding between the races. Emphasizing diversity also has positive effects on several measures of student satisfaction, including overall satisfaction, as well as satisfaction with student life, opportunities to take interdisciplinary courses, facilities, and the quality of instruction. Institutional Diversity Emphasis also has positive effects on political liberalism.

Consistent with its positive effect on the students' personal commitment to promoting racial understanding, Institutional Diversity Emphasis has a negative effect on the belief that racial discrimination is no longer a problem in America. Institutional Diversity Emphasis also has negative effects on students' interest in joining a social sorority or fraternity, on getting married while in college, and on the belief that the chief benefit of college is to increase earning power. This last measure is another measure that was judged as being relevant to general education, which hopefully weakens the student's tendency to see liberal learning in strictly instrumental or monetary terms.

What, then, can institutions do to begin shifting some of their implicit values more in the direction of talent development and public service? I would suggest that we start with the curriculum. Curricular offerings, and especially curriculum requirements, are a concrete manifestation of what the institution considers important. The curriculum, in other words, is a manifestation of our implicit values. The values of resource acquisition and reputation enhancement could have subtle but important effects on the way we approach curricular reform. For example, much of the talk we hear these days about reforming the curriculum, especially the K-12 level, seems to be focused on the development of practical skills and especially on skills in science and math. From a purely materialistic and competitive value perspective, this emphasis makes perfectly good sense, because the principal purpose of education, from this perspective, would be to produce a skilled work force to help our businesses and industries run more productively and efficiently. On the other hand, if you view the issue of curricular reform from a talent development or social service perspective, or from the perspective of what the society really needs at this point in its development, you begin to realize that there are many critical talents that are being largely ignored in our curricula reform efforts.

Let's take just one of these talents, which I'd like to call good citizenship. If you look at our explicitly stated institutional values as reflected in college catalogs and mission statements, you will often find mentioned something like good citizenship. In other words, many of us are explicitly committed to promoting the value of good citizenship in our students, helping them become productive and responsible citizens. I don't want to dwell on the issue of what constitutes good citizenship, but under a democratic government, certainly there would seem to be at least two minimal criteria for good citizenship—that the individual be informed about the issues of the day and that he or she be involved in the political process. As a matter of fact, without an informed and involved electorate, democracy simply doesn't work. Judging from the quality and quantity of citizen participation in the political process (and I include college educated citizens here), it seems clear that we're not very well involved and probably not very well informed. The two go hand in hand, of course. It's true that when election time rolls around, we hear a lot of talk about participation, but little is said about the critical importance of being informed, not only about the candidates but also about the issues of the day. A true understanding of democracy's dependence on a well-informed citizenry would lead voters to reject outright any candidate or politician who deliberately misinformed them, since such behavior clearly undermines the democratic process. The high level of tolerance that our citizenry seems to have for politicians who distort the facts, or simply lie, is just one more indication of how far we still have to go before we have a truly functioning democracy. In fact, a visitor from another planet might well conclude we either don't understand democracy, don't support the principles of democracy, or both.

But where in our curriculum is there any evidence of concern with developing the talent of citizenship? Where in our teacher training programs is such a concern manifest? Where is it manifested in the "America 2000" plan for education, for example? Even though college catalogs and mission statements often mention such things as citizenship and social responsibility, it's difficult to find much in the curriculum of any college or university that seems to reflect this value. For that matter, the modern college curriculum seems to pay little attention to the development of other potentially important character qualities like honesty, social responsibility, self understanding, tolerance, empathy, and the like. Even if we limit our concerns to the so-called basic skills, our contemporary curricula seem to be exclusively concerned with math, reading, writing and speaking, with little or no emphasis being given to the very important skill of good listening. Being able to listen to and understand the thoughts and feelings of others is obviously one of the basic skills required for the sort of cooperative living that's so necessary in a fully functioning democracy. It's important to realize that the concept of citizenship goes far beyond participation in the electoral process. Citizenship has to do with how each of us relates to our families, our churches, our jobs, and our communities.

This emphasis on the cognitive in our curriculum might make sense from the perspective of trying to produce a skilled work force for business and industry. On the other hand, if you view the issue of educational reform from the broader perspective of what we need, then we really ought to pay more attention to these affective talents like good citizenship, honesty, and social responsibility. This

continuing neglect of the affective side of our students' development is lamentable, but perhaps understandable given the spirit of the times. Our cognitive and intellectual achievements have been remarkable. You could make a laundry list—atomic energy, genetic engineering, modern medicine, computers, electronics, transportation, communication systems and so forth. What concerns me is that our obvious success in developing new and better ways of understanding and manipulating material things may have mesmerized us into thinking that the solution to the human dilemma depends simply on more and more material and scientific progress. You've got an environmental problem? Just develop a better technology. You've got a problem with a hostile neighbor? Develop some new weaponry. You've got a problem with crime? Buy a gun, get better burglar alarms, more and better jails, and give police more sophisticated crime fighting gadgetry. This materialistic world view tempts us to ignore the emotional and spiritual divisions that threaten our very existence. Religious fanaticism, hatred, fear, envy, racism, sexism, ethnocentrism, and nationalism aren't problems that science and technology can solve for us. Hard science really has nothing to say about these problems. What this tells me is that it's time to readdress the balance. It's time to begin shifting some of our educational energy in the direction of our value side, our affective side, to begin concerning ourselves much more directly with development of values and beliefs that are going to heal our divisions, and which will help to create a society that's less materialistic, fearful, and competitive, and more generous, trusting, and cooperative.

Alexander W. Astin, selected as the person "most admired for creative, insightful thinking" in the field of higher education in a 1985 *Change* magazine poll, is professor of higher education at UCLA and director of the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA. Author of 17 books and over 200 other publications, his major areas of inquiry include the outcomes and values of higher education, institutional quality and leadership, equality of opportunity and access, assessment and research methodology, and the interface between research and policy. His latest book is *Assessment for Excellence: The Philosophy and Practice of Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education.*

A 1990 study in the *Journal of Higher Education* identified Dr. Astin as the most frequently cited author in the field of education. He has been a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences and has served as director of research for both the American Council on Education and the National Merit Scholarship Corporation. For the past 25 years Dr. Astin has been directing the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, an ongoing national study of some seven million students, 200,000 faculty and staff, and 1300 higher education institutions. He has received eight honorary degrees and eleven awards for outstanding research and service.

Who Is There Big Enough To Love the Whole Planet?

William Sloane Coffin
President Emeritus, SANE/FREEZE: Campaign for Global Security

It's my real conviction that we've come to one of those ripe moments in our history. William Blake properly warned, "if you trap the moment before it is ripe, the tears of repentance you will certainly wipe. But if once you let the right moment go, you'll never wipe off the tears of woe." I think that America won itself a new chance in the election of fall 92. We may well be facing a future far preferable to the one that was predictable only a short while ago. Certainly a better world is both imaginable and feasible. But as always, if there's a way to the better, it lies in first taking a full look at the worse. To a degree almost inconceivable, the U.S. has neglected the poor, the bloat of the military, the size of the deficit, the sorrow of the aged and infirmed. An estimated 135,000 guns attend school every day. Our children are murdering one another. The United States is presently spiritually devastated, and is the most crime-ridden, drug-ridden, debt-ridden nation on the face of the earth. Not that other nations are sinless, far from it. Yates was probably right when he said: "...There is not left a virtuous nation and the best of us walk by candle light."

We say the planet is fragile, but it is really the human race that is fragile. It is far from certain that we care enough about posterity to pay the price for its survival. If we don't think about the future, we're not going to have one. And it is certainly part of the responsibility of the university, not the major responsibility, I would never argue that, but certainly a part of the responsibility of the university to look at the future. It may not be the primary business of faculty and the administration, but it is the primary business of students. They're going to live in the future. Someone's got to look seriously at the future, in the classroom or out of the classroom. The future is looked at a little here, there and the other place, but not consistently and not with the sense of seriousness that I think the survival of the planet demands.

So I entitled this: "Who is there big enough to love the whole planet?" E. B. White, in his journal within two weeks of the bombing of Pearl Harbor in December of 1941, after talking about how patriotism and nationalism are now going to be big things, said "but the real question is who is there big enough to love the whole planet?" If I had another title it might be the words of the great four star general of World War II, Omar Bradley—"It is time to steer by the stars and not by the lights of each passing ship." Or if it was a scriptural title it might be out of Proverbs: "Without a vision the people perish."

I want to describe for you a vision for the future. The issues I am going to deal with, if we're going to be serious about social responsibility, are issues that have to be raised in one way or another. We'll get to how and how not later on. Of all Michaelangelo's powerful figures, none is more poignant to me than the figure of the Centurion in the Last Judgment on the wall of the Sistine Chapel. One hand over one eye and in the other eye a look of dire recognition. He understood but too late. Now I'm not quite sure whether Michaelangelo painted what I saw in that, but to me he painted a very familiar tragic story, namely, the truth that stares us in the face, we don't see until it hits us in the face. That's the story of human history. A crisis is rarely a crisis until it is validated by disaster. Hell is truth seen too late. I recall this figure because I think we too are hell bent, unless we open our eyes and see the major challenge of the 20th century.

The world as a whole has to be managed and not just its parts. It wasn't so long ago, World War II for example, when we worried that this part of the world couldn't defend itself against that part of the world. Today, it's the whole that can't protect itself against the parts. In World War II, nations at war targeted one another. Today the whole world lives on the target of World War III. We're living in a transition period. But let's not get complacent about it. Where there was one nuclear power in the Soviet Union before, now there are four. If Russia breaks up, as it threatens to with 50% inflation, what we see in Bosnia and Herzegovenia will be small potatoes. If we do not soon

stop the production and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the whole planet may end up a dreary waste of ash and cinder silenced by death. It's naive not to see that is a real possibility.

Likewise, if we do not soon evolve a lifestyle more considerate of the environment, instead of blowing ourselves into nuclear oblivion, we may simply bake slowly in a stew of industrial pollutants. And if Abraham Lincoln was right, that a nation cannot long endure half slave, half free, it is unreasonable to expect the planet to endure, partly prosperous, mostly miserable. In short, the planet is at risk and in an order of magnitude never before even imagined. No longer is the survival unit a single nation or a single anything. The survival unit from now on, forever and ever, is the entire human race, plus the environment. Beyond saluting their flags, you think it might be possible, at least every Friday, to have students in this country and other countries around the world, pledge allegiance to the Earth, to the flora and fauna, to the human life that it supports, one planet indivisible, with clean air, soil and water, economic justice, and peace for all. That would make a nice pledge at least once a week, a little bit of consciousness-raising. It would probably be considered too tacky at institutions of higher education.

That being the case, it grieves me as a Christian to watch my fellow Christians retreat from the giant social issues of the day into the pygmy world of private piety. The chief religious question is certainly not, if ever it was, "what must I do to be saved?" It is rather what must we all do to save God's creation? I think this is particularly sad because I happen to think that the religious community, not only the Christian, but the Jewish and Moslem as well, actually has a kind of saving vision. It is the ancient pragmatic vision and the ancient prophetic vision of human unity now become an urgent pragmatic necessity. According to this ancient vision, we all belong one to another, everyone of us, 5 1/2 billion people on the face of the earth. That's the way God made us. From a Christian point of view, Christ died to keep us that way, which means that our sin is only and always that we put asunder what God has put together. Human unity, according to this vision, is not something we are called on to create, only to recognize and make manifest. According to this vision, territorial discrimination has always been as evil as religious or racial discrimination. This is something Pablo Casals recognized when he said: "To love one's country is a splendid thing, but why should love stop at the border."

But now we have to confront an irony which is profound and complicated. At the very moment in history when the mere notion of national sovereignty is about as obsolete as states' rights, the three most powerful movements in the world today are nationalism, ethnicity, and racism. All three can be attributed largely to sin. Once again we are putting asunder what God has joined together. But it would be a mistake to leave it at that and not recognize the many legitimate differences that exist within our common humanity. What I'm going to say now gets at the question of multiculturalism. Nationalism, ethnicity, race, gender, our different sexual orientations, all have their rightful place. The universalism that is their opposite tends to blur, deny, and too often repress what is particular about them. Euro-centrism would be perfectly alright if it didn't have pretensions of being universal. And that's what the objection to it is of course. The fear of those who are Euro-centric is understanding at least subconsciously their own pretension. They are afraid that Afro-centrism also has pretensions to universalism, which I don't think anybody has ever suggested.

In any case, it is understandable that people want to preserve their roots, land, language, and culture, and also want to champion a gender or race that for so long has been cruelly maligned. It should come as no surprise that everywhere people are asserting the particular over and against the universal. It is not surprising that nations themselves are breaking up. For while a nation state is clearly too small for the big problems of life, nation states are often appear too big for the small problems of life. The challenge today is to seek a unity that celebrates diversity, to unite the particular with the universal, to recognize the need for roots, but also that the whole point of having roots is to put forth branches. What is intolerable is for differences to become idolatrous. When absolutized, nationalism and ethnicity, race and gender are reactionary impulses. They become pseudo-religions, without the power to make human beings human. No human being's identity is exhausted by his/her gender, race, ethnic origin, or national loyalty. A woman will say "I am a woman" as if that exhausts her entire definition. Or a black person will say "I am a black man" and that exhausts my entire definition. Anyone who says that has abdicated a moral obligation to represent the human condition. No human being is fully human unless he or she finds the universal in the particular. The particular is to be celebrated, the universal is to be exalted. When we recognize that people have more in common than they have in conflict, and when what people have in conflict seems uppermost, this is the time when what we have in common needs most to be affirmed. Put differently, human rights are more important than the politics of identity, and university people should be notorious boundary crossers.

Now back to the world scene in another way. It can't be denied that present national policies and structures are not only incapable of solving worldwide problems, they

in fact exacerbate them. And thus the future is slipping away from us. To preserve the planet, we need minimally and immediately to moderate national sovereignty and increase global loyalty. Norman Coussins reminded us that we have a useful analogy in American history. After the thirteen colonies successfully declared independence from Great Britain, they agreed to govern themselves according to the so-called Articles of Confederation. But the Articles of Confederation didn't work. They *mirrored* the difficulties of the day more than they *resolved* the difficulties of the day. So to their great credit, our spiritual forebears quickly abandoned the Articles of Confederation in favor of a constitution which demanded the sacrifice of a certain amount of autonomy for the sake of a more effective, stronger whole.

The United Nations today is the Articles of Confederation. The United Nations charter is a pre-atomic document. The whole organization was organized for an era that was already over. Einstein said at the time that the release of the power of the atom has changed everything except our thinking, thus we drift toward a catastrophe of unparalleled magnitude. A Latin American diplomat at the UN said that around here things tend to disappear. If it is a small conflict between two small nations and we deal with it, the conflict disappears. If it is a conflict between a small nation and a large nation, then the small nation disappears. If it is a conflict between two large nations, the UN disappears. The UN disappears because not one of over 180 sovereign states of the world has seen fit to surrender one iota of its sovereignty. The UN hasn't failed the world, the world has failed the UN. The world, despite all these great institutions of higher education, has failed to see the truth staring them in the face. All have failed to make what we might call the magnum conceptual leap forward that the times demand. To quote Einstein again, "imagination is more important than knowledge." That ought to be written over the portals of every single institution of higher education from sea to shining sea. It is not enough for the academic world to analyze the world as is and ask why, we need also to imagine the world as it might be and ask, why not?

We need to imagine a world whose citizens, for example, will be as mindful of international law as they are of domestic law and so obey the decisions of the world court at the Hague. Imagine if President Reagan, when the Hague handed down its decision, 10 to 1, that the mining of the harbor in Managua was against international law and demanded reparations from the U.S, had said, this is the worse decision I have even heard from any court in all human history, but because the Hague has pronounced we will obey. It would be a different world. But we don't have any concept that we have an obligation to obey international law to anything like the same degree that we have to maintain domestic law.

We need to imagine a world whose peacekeeping forces will be larger than any national force. Only then can there be genuine collective security where the strength of all is for the defense of each. We need to imagine a world whose international agencies will be supported by an international income tax based on GNP or perhaps energy consumption. If that seems way out, recall that so did a national income tax, one at the turn of the century that was urged on Americans by William Jennings Bryant. We cannot imagine a world free of conflict for the horizons of the world will always be darkened by dissension, but we can imagine a world free of violent conflict, free of toxic waste, and I'd like to think we can imagine a world in which the yawning chasm that presently divides rich and poor would be greatly narrowed. If all that, especially the vision of a world beyond war, seems hopelessly Utopian, that may simply reflect how far we have slipped behind on a schedule we should have kept if we were serious about saving this planet.

Earlier I suggested two important things. One, the world as a whole has to be managed and two, the planet is threatened on three major fronts, one by the production, modernization and proliferation of weapons, particularly of mass destruction, two by the way we live in our environment, as in a hotel, leaving the mess for others to clean up, and three by a world of wretched excess and wretched despair. Now let's put it in more positive terms. We should make the conquest of war, the preservation of nature, and the pursuit of social justice, a grand preoccupation of every institution of higher education. I don't think it is too much to ask the university to consider the conquest of war, the preservation of nature, and the pursuit of social justice, something that social responsibility demands.

Above all, and at almost any risk, we must get the world beyond war. It is simply not enough to wish for peace. We have to will it, pray for it, think for it, struggle for it, suffer for it, as if the whole world depended upon it, as indeed it does. I suggest that we need first of all a comprehensive test ban treaty. Every country in the whole world, with the exception of England and the United States, has accepted the notion of no more nuclear testing. It has only been the United States and Great Britain that have held this one up. And quickly thereafter, an agreed on halt to the production of all nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. The disarmament presently taking places needs to be accelerated worldwide. No wonder you can't get any peace in Bosnia or Herzegovenia. Too many weapons. The world is awash with weapons. Same thing

in Somalia. The United States, since 1985, has been the number one supplier of arms to Somalia, and we've put enough stuff in there to keep the fighting going for another 50 years.

To see that this disarmament occurs rapidly and responsibly, President Clinton ought to say to Les Aspin, "your primary responsibility is to tell me how we can responsibly and quickly start disarming this whole world." Elementary Doctor Watson, except within the Beltway! Onsight inspection, without right of refusal, would of course constitute a significant step in moderating national sovereignty and increasing global loyalty. And needless to say, disarmament treaties will need the threat of sanctions for noncompliance. Morally speaking, it is unacceptable that any nation would promote its foreign policy goals by the sale and transfer of weapons. Two, it is unacceptable that any company make any commercial profit by the sale of weapons. It is shocking that military deterence today should be directed primarily not against a foreign enemy, but against domestic unemployment. This situation could have been avoided had the need for conversion to a peace time economy been anticipated by more than just the peace community. Just as the first step toward the abolition of slavery was the abolition of the slave trade, so now the first step toward the eventual abolition of national military arsenals should be the abolition of arms trade. Sellers must be held as culpable as buyers. The United Nations should be asked to publicize and monitor all sales and all transfers of arms from any one country to another country. This is the only way of getting serious about disarmament.

A couple of more things about nuclear disarmament. Rajih Ghandi, who was murdered in 1988, said in a special session on disarmament at the UN, among other fine things, "history is replete with myths parading as iron laws of science"..."that the white race is superior to the colored races, that men are superior to women, that colonization was a civilizing mission, that nations that have nuclear weapons are responsible powers and those that don't are not." Just as a skinny person can't talk persuasively to a fat one about the virtues of not overeating, so nuclear powers cannot convince non-nuclear ones to renounce access to nuclear weapons, not until the nuclear powers themselves start seriously to disarm. Either they disarm or they must face the fact that any nation in the world that wants nuclear weapons eventually is going to get them. And by the time they get them, they'll be hardly larger than a softball. And then where's your arms control? The whole world becomes nuclear free or the whole planet becomes a nuclear porcupine. Take your choice. This is stuff that we don't deal with at universities. Occasionally we do. There are some good courses in history that project ahead, and some physicists who are very much onto these problems, but the university as a whole doesn't get a hold of this. I've never seen a mid-year three day conference, for instance, sponsored by the university administration on the future of our planet or the future of our students.

Finally, even if by the grace of God we succeed in ridding the earth of weapons of mass destruction, the ability to make them will be part of the storehouse of human knowledge forever and ever. That's probably one of the most sobering thoughts you can have about this planet. And it would be mighty naive to think that two nations might go at it with so-called conventional weapons, one side begin to lose and gracefully go down to defeat rather than cranking up the biggies if they had the knowledge to do so. In other words, having bitten the nuclear apple there is no returning to innocence. It's pretty hard not to conclude that humanity has outlived war but doesn't know it.

Now, to save the environment, which would be a second major responsibility, I think we probably need an earth convenant, a form of magna carta for the Earth. Such a charter would expand the universal declaration of human rights so that some of the ethical considerations that presently govern human relations will be extended to nature as well. In religious terms, we need to resanctify nature, reconnect nature to nature's God, only in a more cosmo centric way and less Anthrocentric way. Native Americans know what this is all about. They want us to recognize our spiritual tie with every leaf and creature. Orthodox Christians want us to be not only stewards but also priests of creation.

But I'm not at all optimistic. Not only are we poor stewards of nature, but seriously challenging the notion of stewardship are those who want to think of ourselves as planet managers, and management today includes biotechnology and genetic engineering. In conceptual and moral terms, genetic engineering may well be the most important scientific advance since the smashing of the atom. It suggests that if nature can't put up with our numbers and habits, we'll just have to change nature. We'll create crops that can survive a much warmer climate. We'll alter human genes, and of course there's plenty of extra space in outer space, where shuttle flights indicate, plants grow faster. Now a lot of people in our universities are talking this kind of language. They are impatient with moral restraints. They rebuke us for panicking. They say we should be looking foward to our next evolutionary exam. While I have many doubts about our passing that exam, I have very few about our taking it. Because medical cures, more and better food, as well as other good things, are bound to result from advances in biotechnology, it feels

wrong to oppose its advance. But that's the way so many of us felt in the fifties when President Eisenhower extolled atoms for peace. Few foresaw the way we would charge ahead with the production of nuclear power with no real solution at hand or even in sight for the nuclear waste that we are now told will be radioactive for 25 years. Now, because proponents of genetic engineering are intrigued by nature's possibilities more than they revere nature itself, they display more hubris than humility. For that reason alone, theirs is a very perilous undertaking. Now if some of us at a university can't oppose genetic engineering unconditionally, at least our qualms need very much to become part of the public dialogue.

First of all, there needs to be a public dialogue, and as far as I know, there isn't much public dialogue on this as yet in universities. People need to get their qualms out in front in order to take on these genetic engineers. We need desperately to have public conversation on this before it's too late. I find compelling the words of Dennis Hayes, chairperson of Earth Day 1990—"The most fundamental human truth is that although we humans routinely violate our own laws, we can't break nature's laws." We can only prove them. The other thing to be said about the environment is that we need urgently to start implementing a kind of Marshall Plan that Vice President Gore outlines in his book. There's only one major omission in Gore's book. He doesn't make the connection between nuclear waste and saving the environment which may have something to do with the fact that Oak Ridge is located in Tennessee. He's very good on the ozone layer, but he doesn't mention Oak Ridge or Rocky Flats or anything out west. Last year when I was teaching in Tennessee, I asked an old pal in Memphis "what am I supposed to think of your Senator Gore?" He said, "Well you might think that Senator Gore prefers questions that are complicated to those that are difficult. The ozone layer, that's complicated...Oak Ridge, that's difficult."

If we do get serious about the environment, the results could be dramatic. The environmental point of view turns us away from the possessive individualism that has long been our secular credo and towards the interdependency that alone can save us. It was one thing for people to consume nature's surpluses. Today we are destroying the productive base of both present and future surpluses and only together, all together, can we save that base. Only together, all together, can we eliminate toxic waste in the atmosphere. Only together can we engage in the serious disarmament that will spring loose the funds to fight pollution. Because saving the environment is an enterprise so positive and so inclusive, its success can only make the military impulse look even more neurotic. If you want to do something for disarmament, do something for the environment. They'll have to suspend environmental laws to reopen Savannah River Plant for instance. They cannot produce nuclear weapons without invoking national security and suspending EPA laws. As godless a place as most Universities are, I would suggest it's only reverence that can restrain our violence toward nature. It is primarily our lack of wonder that prevents our foreseeing and forestalling the havoc we leave in our wake. It's well to recall Chesterson's remark—"the world does not lack for wonder only for a sense of wonder." Without wonder I doubt if we'll save the planet. I'm quite sure that God approved e.e. cummings preference when he said "I would rather learn from one bird how to sing than teach ten thousand stars how not to dance."

Finally, we need to get beyond charity. I think charity is a matter of personal attributes, justice is a matter of public policy. Never can the first be a substitute for the second. Here in America and in the Third World, the "haves" today have more than ever, while the "have nots" are more numerous and more undeniably miserable. If people have equal dignity, there cannot be such degrees of economic inequality. William Penn once wrote: "it is a reproach to religion and government to suffer so much poverty and excess." If we all have equal dignity, why do we have so much economic inequality? The United States has known three guilded ages, the 1890s, the 1920s, and the 1980s. These were ages marked by a gaudy orgy of getting and spending, times when avarice was counted a good thing, a sign of social fitness. How much the three ages resembled each other is illustrated by the Populist platform issued just over a 100 years ago on July 2, 1892. The Populists declared they were meeting "in the midst of a nation brought to the verge of moral, political and material ruin. Corruption dominates the ballot box, the legislature, Congress, and touches even the ermine of the bench. The fruits of the toil of millions are boldly stolen to build up colossal fortunes for a few. From the same prolific womb of governmental injustice we breed the two great classes—tramps and millionaires." Sounds pretty contemporary.

Ninety years later, President Reagan announced, "what I want to see above all is that this remains a country where someone can always get rich." With little concern for who got poor and with the obvious consent of Congressional Democrats, President Reagan combined tax cuts for the rich, with spending cuts for the poor. The result was a massive upward redistribution of wealth. We saw the incomes of the top ten percent of the population rise by 74% while those in the bottom 10% fell 10.5%. And I'm using Republican figures for this. The fortunate top fifth took home more money than the other four-fifths put together. During the Reagan years, in New York, the ten

years I was there, I watched the decay in that city of everything not connected with profit making. I mean everything—schools, libraries, roads. Even the public monuments in New York went up for private consideration. Ben and Jerry, the great ice cream makers of Vermont, took on a monument at 72nd Street and Broadway.

Speaking of Ben and Jerry, they remind us that in other countries, they have a much different standard of justice. Looking at Sweden, Ben and Jerry decided that they would adopt the Swedish model, where as a general rule, a CEO never makes more than six times the salary of the lowest paid employee in the company. That means that Ben and Jerry never accepted a salary more than six times the salary of the ice cream scooper. Now in Sweden there is a fierce debate raging. Conservatives are saying it ought to be 7 to 1, radicals are countering, no it ought to be 5 to 1. In this country it's 40 to 1 and there is no debate!

I said every country's education reflects that country's ideology. That means that there's a particular burden, and I put it right smack on the faculty, to challenge the rest of the nation and not resemble the rest of the nation. Let universities proclaim the norms for justice, give primary emphasis not to accomplishment, but to need. Any decent religious norm for justice says it's not accomplishment, it's need. If you read the Bible, it's not the poor who cause problems for the rich, it's the rich who are always a problem for the poor. Oscar Romero, the great modern mosignoir of El Salvador, never called the poor "los pobres," he called them "los appovrecidos," those made poor, the impoverished. Language is so important. If we purified our language a little bit more and called the poor the impoverished, we've have a much better understanding of what this is all about.

There's no reason why the well-to-do should begrudge the checks that allow the elderly and the disabled to live better. Why should a nation resent the free medical care that allows poor mothers and their children to see doctors more often. When Congress created a Food Stamp program, recipients not only ate better, but had a little money to spend on other things. When Congress subsidized Section 8 housing, families fortunate enough to get a certificate lived in somewhat nicer apartments and paid far less rent. Now without question, many poor have many vices, mostly those that go with powerlessness. But it is outrageous to pretend that families can make do on the sums that welfare kindly provides them. Welfare is a hypocritical system that forces its recipients to engage in fraud. Most welfare mothers try to find extra money, not because they want to cheat but because they love their children! It's that simple. Most stay on welfare not because they like it, but because in most communities, there are more unskilled workers than there are unskilled jobs, and very few programs to train people for jobs that pay more. And of course it is a gross exaggeration to say we have no money to pay for anti-poverty programs. In the long run of course, it's cheaper to eradicate poverty than to maintain it. Every year, we pay huge sums for poverty and crime, in prison construction, in output lost because of unemployment. As Sister Teresa has written "ending poverty would not only save us money it might save our souls."

In political history, the central question has always been: do you enhance the economic prospects for the many or safeguard the accumulated wealth of the few? The problem has never been the "haves" versus the "have nots," it has been between the have too much and the have too little. Roosevelt stated it well: "My fellow Americans, progress is not measured by how much we add to the abundance of those who already have a great deal, but rather by how much we do for those who have too little." I think we could all agree, it's better to multiply the loaves and fishes for all than to make a larger tastier dinner for the few. Now I'm not mentioning rich and poor abroad, because to a degree rarely recognized, foreign policy is a reflection of domestic attitudes towards domestic problems. In the 1980s, our foreign aid to places like El Salvador and third world countries everywhere, helped the rich get richer, the poor get poorer, and the military get more powerful. No one should have been surprised. It was an exact reflection of what was going on here at home. If we get serious about disarmament here, if we get serious about preserving the environment, if we get serious about pursuing social justice for our own folk, we'll find our foreign aid will do much more to liberate rather than incarcerate the poor abroad.

So there is a vision of the future. All of us don't have to share it, but all of us have to struggle to find a vision of the future. We have to recognize the world as a whole has to be managed and not just its parts. I would suggest that the three major fronts on which the battle has to take place are once again: one, to get the world beyond war, stop the production and proliferation of arms, not only of mass destruction, but also so-called conventional weapons, which are conventional only in the sense of being non-nuclear, not in the sense of being non-lethal; two, we have to preserve the environment; and three, we need to pursue social justice so that we can narrow the gap between rich and poor which presently is always widening. How we go about doing it is obviously going to be very difficult, but I rest my case there. If we're going to be serious about social responsibility at universities, this is the kind of stuff we've got to be thinking about.

William Sloane Coffin came to national attention during the 18 years that he served as chaplain of Yale University. During that period, he became known for his activism in the civil rights movement and in the movement to end U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War. Currently, Rev. Coffin is president emeritus of the 170,000 member SANE/FREEZE: Campaign for Global Security, the largest peace and justice organization in the United States, and an active lecturer on the imperative of reversing the arms race, ending intervention, and redressing economic imbalances.

A former student of music (he studied with Nadia Boulanger in Paris), Rev. Coffin served as an infantry officer in World War II and in the CIA during the Korean War. While senior minister of New York City's Riverside Church, he founded the church's acclaimed Disarmament Program and travelled widely promoting international peace and human rights. Rev. Coffin is the author of *Once to Every Man, The Courage to Love* and *Living the Truth in a World of Illusions* and has been honored with 11 honorary degrees, keys to 3 cities and honorary citizenship of 3 others.

Concurrent Session Abstracts

Friday, February 5, 10:30 a.m.

Systematic Approaches for Creating Community on the College Campus: Networks and Collaborations

Educators and student affairs professionals in particular are spending more time than ever before discussing ways of promoting a culture of care and tolerance on the college campus in a climate of limited resources and competing agendas. Too frequently our best efforts fall short of engaging students in the life of the campus. How might the academy create a sense of community that is naturally driven by an intrinsic motive to share and create? This presentation will address how the design of networks and collaborations can lead to more interaction among students, staff and faculty in building community.

Presenter: Dr. Gina Frieden, Counseling Center, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, Kentucky

Student Service and the Struggle for a Public Voice

Educators tend to invoke the norm of social responsibility as a justification for service and infer that through service students will become more altruistic. Service is not a safe, apolitical approach to community involvement. Service is a connection to the public realm and an opportunity to examine our role in critical social issues. This presentation examines the models of political and moral engagement that students bring to service.

Presenter: Dr. Kerrissa Heffernan, Assistant Professor, Lasell College, Newton, Massachusetts

Social Correction, Mutual Respect and Valued Concepts of Right and Wrong

Social correction, facilitated by mutual respect, is a process used by a social group to teach, preserve and modify, when necessary, the group's valued concepts of right and wrong, thus enhancing the social responsibility of the members. The process may be applied by the social group within the context of at least four different types of transgressions: personal transgressions, transgressions against their society (their social group), moral transgressions and transgressions against the dominant society.

Presenter: Dr. Richard J. Hofmann, Professor of Educational Leadership, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio

The Values of the Academy: An Examination of the Values of Faculty in Higher Education in the United States

Most studies of faculty values and faculty activities have focused on extrinsic values (such as political values) or faculty activities and faculty work (such as research, teaching, and governance). The aim of this study was to examine and identify the dominant values, the changing values, and the emerging values held by selected faculty in higher education. The research of this study incorporated an extensive review of the literature and interviews of faculty. Four "national" faculty and twelve faculty from three liberal arts institutions participated in a dialogue about the values of the academy. The dialogue was framed in the context of three broad categories drawn from a review of literature of values, faculty, and student impact in higher education. Categories framing the discussion are: how faculty make "sense" of their lives; the individual, corporate, and institutional value "commitments" at work in the academy; and the perceived emerging tensions and value concerns of faculty in higher education.

Those values emerging from the faculty interviews and the literature review were identified in two sets: "value affirmations" and "value tensions." The "affirmations" represent values broadly held in higher education. The "tensions" represent values about which there is disagreement, divergent opinions, or considerable debate. The study identifies seven values" affirmations" and thirteen values "in tension."

Presenter: Dr. Steve G.W. Moore, Vice President for Student Life, Seattle Pacific University, Seattle Washington

Unnatural Acts in the World, the Parish, and the College

Undergraduates need more than courses, activities, and causes. More than ever, they need sources of empowerment and gratification that remain, often, unnatural even to adults: involvement in making (not just running) something, association with persons who can strengthen their language, and knowledge of wider contexts in which to situate local and personal problems and anxieties. Faculty and staff members need to find occasions for affirming, providing, and modeling these necessary but unnatural acquisitions.

Presenter: Dr. Charles Vandersee, Assistant Dean for Special Scholars and Associate Professor of English, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia

Friday, February 5, 3:30 p.m.

Social Responsibility Begins at Home? Creating a Democratic Community in an Undergraduate Residence Hall

Community development among 18-22 year old resident students must balance a variety of built-in conflicts and tensions: psychosocial, cultural, cognitive and structural. This discussion focuses on creating educational processes and structures which help students balance the demands of community with individualistic achievement demands of a college education.

Presenter: Dr. Jane Fried, Assistant Professor and Coordinator of the College Student Development Program

Academic Integrity Among College Students: Student and Faculty

Over 6,000 students and 800 faculty participated in this study of academic dishonesty. This session discussed personal and institutional factors that correlate with higher levels of student cheating with particular emphasis on the influence of honor codes. It also discussed how faculty handle incidents of cheating. This study used instruments similar to those employed by Bowers in his landmark study of cheating in the 1960's and longitudinal comparisons between these two databases will be presented.

Dr. Donald McCabe, Associate Professor of Management, Rutgers University, Newark, New Jersey

Empowerment of Students Against Racism: The "Layering Model" at Seton Hall University

Unlike many institutions that rely upon one model program or activity to increase racial/multi-cultural sensitivity or reduce racism, Seton Hall utilizes a multiple-model approach. The major stimulus behind this action is that racial indifference escalated to the point of physical violence. The rationale for our approach is that "repetition is the essence of learning." The "layering" is achieved by exposing the student population to different racism reduction activities throughout the student's four years.

Presenter: Dr. Forrest M. Pritchett, Freshman Mentor, Seton Hall University, South Orange, New Jersey

Confrontation: Developing Values Through Communication

This session focused on the importance of students using confrontation as a step in supporting the goals and values of the community. A sample case study was used with participants to explore their own confrontation skills. The "Challenges & Choices" program will be explained so participants can see it applied with their specific case study and its potential in teaching confrontation skills.

Presenter: Dr. Judith Sindlinger, Records and Advisement Center, University of Central Florida, Orlando, Florida

Social Responsibility: Can Our Words Lead to Actions?

Graduate students and professionals who are prepared to meet their responsibilities to higher education and society must achieve an understanding of the diverse groups represented in the student body and confront their own values and biases about the groups. Graduate students discussed what they learned from a class on diverse populations and read entries from their journals illustrating shifts in their attitudes toward the groups and behavioral changes resulting from the experience.

Presenters: Ms. Meg Jones, Graduate Student, Higher Education, Florida State University and Dr. Barbara Mann, Associate Professor of Higher Education, Florida State University. Co-presenters: Students in the Florida State University Master's Program in Student Affairs: Steve Burrell, Deborah Doolittle, Louisa Ellis, Kathleen Franks, Kris Gustinger, Kim Kendrick, Judy M. Lawrence, Peter C. Leighton, Kelly Maxwell, Robert Risavy, Todd E. Taylor, Karen B. Temple, and Matha Thornton

Saturday, February 6, 10:30 a.m.

Caring as an Emerging Value in the Classroom-as-Community

We develop the theme of responsible caring in the classroom-as-community. Handouts provide theory, research and context for an interactive session in which participants will: 1) practice rules for classroom community, 2) define caring through drawings, 3) exchange roles through writing and reading exercises, and 4) journal for intrapersonal communication. We describe software for student journaling which facilitates value development.

Presenters: Dr. Ann Dapice, Development Specialist, Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College, Miami, Oklahoma and Dr. Larry Cobb, Professor of Government, Slippery Rock University, Slippery Rock, Pennsylvania

Integrating Values Education Into an Elective Program: Environmental Studies Pathway

Hollins College created its Pathways program as a way to give coherence and structure to a student's elective program. The Environmental Studies Pathway is built around four, team taught, interdisciplinary seminars. All Pathways include core seminars, an experiential learning component, and a "capstone" experience.

The purpose of this Pathway is to enable students to explore the multiple ways in which the environment comes to be valued, what public issues grow out of environmental concerns, and the ethical principles that are relevant to problem solving in this area. Other Pathway's being developed include: Women's Studies, Global Studies, Imagination Studies, and Studies in the Western Tradition. All will explicitly seek to integrate value questions and moral issues into their core programs.

Presenter: Dr. Allie Frazier, Professor of Philosophy, Hollins College, Roanoke, Virginia

Reclaiming the Sacred: Connecting the Student's Experience of a Living Religious Tradition to Ethical Development During the Undergraduate Years

"Reclaiming the Sacred: Connecting the Student's Experience of a Living Religious Tradition to Ethical Development During the Undergraduate Years" suggested ways by which the undergraduate can be helped to reflect on a particular religious tradition and connect the teachings of that tradition to his/her ethical development beginning with the freshman year. The paper suggested that undergraduates are not always sufficiently aware of the ethical nuances of various religious traditions and the way in which the development of personal values is connected with social ethics.

Presenter: Dr. Charles Hagan, Representative for Higher Education and Campus Ministry, United States Catholic Conference, Washington, D.C.

Multicultural Community Building

Individual and community responsibility, multiculturalism and student success were themes of a project underway at the University of Oregon. The project, entitled "Building Community" used a communitarian pedagogy on how individual interests and shared concerns can create a strong learning community. This program focused on three components of the development of this project. They included: the actual design and development of the program, evaluation of the outcome of the project after its first year and the process through which administration and faculty worked collaboratively to develop the program.

Presenters: Ms. Joanie Robertson, Assistant Dean of Students and Ms. Elaine Green, Associate Dean of Students, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon

INSTITUTE ON COLLEGE STUDENT VALUES

Wakulla Springs Lodge and Conference Center
February 4 - 7, 1993

Schedule of Activities

Thursday, February 4

3-5:30 **Registration** *(Wakulla Springs Lodge lobby)*

5:00 **Reception** *(Terrace)*
Musical entertainment by pianist Steve Aldridge

6:00 **Dinner** *(Dining Room)*
Jon Dalton, presiding; Welcome by FSU President Dale Lick

7:45 **Break**

8:00 **Session** *(Dining Room)*

The Undergraduate Experience: In Search of Values--Ernest Boyer, President, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; Introduction by Roy McTarnaghan

9:30 **Cash bar** *(Terrace)*
Musical entertainment by guitarist Steve Walter

Friday, February 5

7:30 **Begin self-serve continental breakfast** *(Dining Room)*
(Full breakfast is available at your own expense in the dining room.)

7:45 **Early bird nature walk with Park Ranger** *(Gather in the lobby)*

9:00 **Session** *(Dining Room)*

Question and Answer Panel with Ernest Boyer--Facilitator, Barbara Varchol. A panel will respond to the address by Ernest Boyer and lead the audience in a question and answer period.

10:15 **Break** – Coffee and tea *(Terrace)*

10:30 **Concurrent Sessions**

Systematic Approaches for Creating Community on the College Campus: Networks and Collaborations--Gina Frieden, Counseling Center, Western Kentucky University *(Cypress Room)*

Student Service and the Struggle for Public Voice--Kerissa Heffernan, Assistant Professor, Lasell College *(Magnolia Room)*

Concurrent Sessions Continued

Social Correction, Mutual Respect and Valued Concepts of Right and Wrong–Rich Hofmann, Professor of Educational Leadership, Miami University *(Ed Ball Room)*

The Values of the Academy: An Examination of the Values of Faculty in Higher Education in the United States--Steve G.W. Moore, Vice President for Student Life, Seattle Pacific University *(Pavilion)*

Unnatural Acts in the World, the Parish, and the College--Charles Vandersee, Assistant Dean for Special Scholars and Associate Professor of English, University of Virginia *(Terrace)*

12:00 **Group photograph** (*Meet in the lobby)*

12:15 **Lunch** *(Dining Room)*

1:30 **Leave for campus** (*Meet in the Parking Lot--Wakulla Lodge*)

2:00 **Session** *(Everglades Auditorium--Florida State Conference Center)*

Learning From Simon's Rock -- Helen Horowitz, Professor of History and American Studies, Smith College; Introduction by Barbara Mann

3:15 **Break**

3:30 **Concurrent Sessions** *(Florida State Conference Center--FSCC)*

Social Responsibility Begins at Home? Creating a Democratic Community in an Undergraduate Residence Hall--Jane Fried, Assistant Professor and Coordinator, College Student Development Program, Northeastern University *(FSCC 117)*

Academic Integrity Among College Students: Student and Faculty Perspective--
Donald McCabe, Associate Professor of Management, Rutgers University
(FSCC 118)

Empowerment of Students Against Racism: The "Layering Model" at Seton Hall University--
Forrest M. Pritchett, Freshman Mentor, Seton Hall University *(FSCC 107)*

Confrontation: Developing Values Through Communication--Judith Sindlinger, Records and Advisement Center, University of Central Florida *(FSCC 115)*

Social Responsibility: Can Our Words Lead to Actions?--Meg Jones, Graduate Student, Florida State University, and Barbara Mann, Associate Professor of Higher Education, Florida State University, coordinating presenters; Steve Burrell, Deborah Doolittle, Louisa Ellis, Kathleen Franks, Kris Gustinger, Kim Kendrick, Judy M. Lawrence, Peter C. Leighton, Kelly Maxwell, Robert Risavy, Todd E. Taylor, Karen B. Temple, and Matha Thornton, Graduate Students, Florida State University, presenters *(FSCC 110)*

5:00 **Cash bar** *(Fireside Lounge)*

Campus tour *(Meet in Fireside Lounge)*

6:15 **Dinner** *(FSCC Dining Room)*

7:30 **Free time in Tallahassee or Return to Wakulla Lodge**
See Registration Packet

9:00 **Cash bar** *(Wakulla Lodge Terrace)*

Saturday, February 6

7:30 **Begin self-serve continental breakfast** *(Terrace)*

9:00 **Session** *(Dining Room)*

Promoting Social Responsibility: A Challenge for Higher Education -- Alexander Astin, Director, Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA; Introduction by Roberta Christie

10:15 **Break** -- Coffee and tea *(Terrace)*

10:30 **Concurrent Sessions**

Caring as an Emerging Value in the Classroom-as-Community--Ann Dapice, Development Specialist, Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College and Larry Cobb, Professor of Government, Slippery Rock University *(Pavilion)*

Integrating Values Education Into an Elective Program: Environmental Studies Pathway--Allie Frazier, Professor of Philosophy, Hollins College *(Terrace)*

Reclaiming the Sacred: Connecting the Student's Experience of a Living Religious Tradition to Ethical Development During the Undergraduate Years--Charles H. Hagan, Representative for Higher Education and Campus Ministry, United States Catholic Conference *(Ed Ball Room)*

Multicultural Community Building--Joanie Robertson, Assistant Dean of Students and Elaine Green, Associate Dean of Students, University of Oregon *(Cypress Room)*

12:00 **Box Lunch / River Boat Cruise** (Redeem coupon in packet for ticket)

2:15 **Session** *(Dining Room)*

Who Is There Big Enough To Love the Whole Planet?--William Sloane Coffin, President Emeritus, SANE/FREEZE: Campaign for Global Security; Introduction by Sherrill Ragans

3:45 **Session** *(Dining Room)*

What is it about the higher education experience that builds community for students? Student Panel: Sandra Rackley, moderator; Introductions by Phyllis McCluskey-Titus

Wakulla Option:

5:30 **Social hour** *(Ed Ball Room)*

6:00 **Dinner** *(Dining Room)*

Angelo's (Ocklocknee Bay) Option:

5:30 **Leave for Wakulla** (Meet in Lobby by Fireplace)

7:00 **Dinner**

9:00 **Return to Wakulla Springs Lodge**

Florida State University Institute on College Student Values

1993 Planning Committee
Jon Dalton, Chair
Vice President for Student Affairs

Heather Martin
Barbara Varchol
Office of the Dean of Students

Janet Lenz
Career Center

Roberta Christie
International Student Center

Bob Kimmel
Thagard Student Health Center

Bob Howard
Oglesby Union

Sherrill Ragans
Dorothea Taylor
Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs

Barbara Mann
Associate Professor of Higher Education

Emily Whitehead
Honors and Scholars Program

Sandra Rackley
Undergraduate Studies

Special thanks to the following:

Board of Regents, State of Florida
Bill Clutter, wood carver
The staff of the Wakulla Springs Lodge and Conference Center
Janet Hayes, Wakulla Springs Lodge
The staff of the Florida State Conference Center
Carol DeLoach and Rene Friedman, Florida State Conference Center
Joyce Howard, Research Coordinator, Vice President for Student Affairs Office
Maedea Davis, Phyllis Dechant, Lucy Carter, Vice President for Student Affairs Office
Phyllis McCluskey-Titus, Housing
Cynthia Everett, Undergraduate Studies
Educational Leadership graduate student volunteers
FSU Physical Plant, Grounds Section
Florida State University Bookstore
Bill's Bookstore